T. F. Torrey

H. C. S. Symonds
Cuddesdon College

Thomas F. Torrance

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

BY

W. BEVERIDGE, M.A.

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1904

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

TO

MY CONGREGATION

AT NEW DEER

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION

OF MUCH KINDNESS

PREFACE.

This little work is nothing more than what it professes to be, a short history of the Westminster Assembly. It is hoped that the work will be found a fair and accurate statement of the historical facts associated with the Assembly. The author has done his best to work over for himself and with his own eyes the materials on which the history is based. These materials are abundant, and it is only too probable that much has escaped his notice and research.

The Westminster Assembly was an epoch in the creed-forming age in which it met, and the results of its deliberations have been far-reaching. Recent events in Scotland, notably the decision of the House of Lords on August 1st, 1904, in the *Free Church of Scotland Appeals Case*, have given a fresh interest to the Assembly and its work, more especially the *Confession of Faith*. Attention may, therefore, be directed to two Notes appended to Chapter IX. These Notes have arisen directly out of the judgment of the House of Lords, and contain matter which may be of some interest to students of the Assembly.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PURITAN PREPARATION.

SECTIONS 1–14.

CHAPTER II.

CALLING, CONSTITUTION, AND CHARACTER OF THE ASSEMBLY.

SECTIONS 15–26.

CHAPTER III.

SCOPE OF THE ASSEMBLY'S DELIBERATIONS AND FIRST WORK.

SECTIONS 27–33.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.

SECTIONS 34–42.

CHAPTER V.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SECTIONS 43–52.

CHAPTER VI.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT (*continued*).

SECTIONS 53–61.

CHAPTER VII.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT (*continued*): TOLERATION.

SECTIONS 62–68.

CHAPTER VIII.

DIRECTORIES: ERASTIANISM: PSALM-BOOK.

SECTIONS 69–84.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

SECTIONS 85–94.

CHAPTER X.

THE CATECHISMS: CLOSE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

SECTIONS 95–103.

APPENDIX.

TABLE OF DATES AND EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY.

1643, June 12. Ordinance passed by Parliament for calling an Assembly of Divines.

,, July 1. The Assembly meets.

,, July 8. The Assembly forms its three Committees.

,, July 12. Revision of the Thirty-nine Articles begun.

,, Sept. 25. "Solemn League and Covenant" adopted.

,, Oct. 12. End of Revision of the Thirty-nine Articles.

,, Oct. 17. "Church Government" under discussion.

1644, May 24. Report and debate on "Directory for Public Worship."

,, Aug. 20. "Confessiou of Faith": appointment of Committee.

,, Nov. 8. "Form of Church Government" sent up to Parliament.

1645, Jan. 3. "Directory for Public Worship" passes House of Commons.

,, Jan. 23. Resolutions passed by House of Commons, containing substance of Presbyterianism.

,, Feb. 7. "Catechism" Committee to be augmented.

,, May 12. "Confession" Committee reports.

,, July 7. The Assembly sends up "Directory for Church Government."

,, Sept. 12. Rous's "Psalms" approved by the Assembly.

1646, April 30. Committee from House of Commons with the *Jus Divinum* Queries.

,, July 19. Death of Dr. Twisse the Prolocutor.

,, Aug. 19. Death of Alexander Henderson at Edinburgh.

,, Dec. 4. "Confession" presented to House of Commons.

1647, April 29. "Confession," with Scriptures, presented to Parliament.
,, Oct. 15. "Larger Catechism" completed.
,, Nov. 9. Rutherfurd, last of Commissioners, leaves for Scotland.
,, Nov. 25. "Shorter Catechism" presented to House of Commons.
1648, April 14. "Catechisms," with Scriptures, presented to Parliament.
,, May 9. *Jus Divinum* Queries under debate.
,, Sept. 20. Request to Commons "to hasten the little Catechism."
,, Dec. 17. George Gillespie dies at Kirkcaldy.
1649, Jan. 30. Execution of Charles I. at Whitehall.
,, Feb. 22. Last numbered Session.
1652, March 25. End of Assembly's work, latterly sitting as a Committee for examining Ministers.

CHAPTER I.

THE PURITAN PREPARATION.

SECTIONS 1–14.

1. The Assembly was the child of its age.
2. The urgency of the need for an Assembly.
3. Beginnings of Puritanism in Wycliffe.
4. Tyndale, "the true Reformer for Great Britain."
5. Hooper first makes Puritan protest very prominent.
6. Keen controversy over clerical vestments.
7. Nonconformity, as in Cartwright and Brown.
8. King James and his aphorism, "No Bishop, no King."
9. The Hampton Court Conference, a significant gathering.
10. King Charles and Laud : the result of their policy.
11. "Foul weather" in Scotland : the *Tables* and the *Covenant.*
12. The Long Parliament and its epoch-making work.
13. The Church question, and the fall of Laudianism.
14. The Ordinance calling the Assembly.

HISTORY

OF THE

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

CHAPTER I.

THE PURITAN PREPARATION.

1. It is scarcely necessary to say of the Westminster Assembly that it was the child of its age. Certainly, the Assembly is a landmark in British Church History; but it is not an isolated landmark. It is like the culminating point in a range of lofty and scarred hills, themselves the outcome of deep-seated combustion. Many events led up to the Westminster Assembly, and it cannot be understood apart from these. Before, therefore, we can understand the Assembly, or be able in any degree to appreciate the fruits of its labour, or determine the place which it holds in our ecclesiastical and national history, we must first of all understand something of the influences which issued in its calling and work.

2. In such a survey, however brief, of the Causes which led up to the Westminster Assembly, it will be necessary to take into account movements in the ecclesiastical and national life both of England and of Scotland.

The Assembly was thoroughly representative; for in both countries a real necessity had arisen for reform. This necessity was very clearly put in the Ordinance of the Lords and Commons, adopted June 12th, 1643. It was resolved "that such a government shall be settled in the Church as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad; and, for the better effecting thereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit and necessary to call an Assembly of learned, godly, and judicious divines." Further on in the same Ordinance the object of the Assembly is stated as follows: "To confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things, touching and concerning the liturgy, discipline, and government of the Church of England, for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false aspersions and misconstructions, as shall be proposed unto them." When Scottish influence came to the front, a wider issue was set before the Assembly. It is stated very clearly in the "Solemn League and Covenant," adopted September 25th, 1643: "We shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the Reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches; and shall endeavour to bring the Churches in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and

uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising."[1] Thus, there had arisen a demand for REFORMATION in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government. How had this demand arisen?

3. The beginnings of the movement in England to which we give the name PURITANISM lie as far back as the days of WYCLIFFE. In the sixteenth century, England had no one to compare with Luther or with Calvin; but in the fourteenth century, two hundred years before Luther or Calvin, England had a Reformer whose ideas were prophetic. What Langland and Chaucer exposed so mercilessly, Wycliffe tried his best to reform. The Church, as Wycliffe said, was rotten to the core; her organisation was corrupt; her government was debased. In 1377, Papal bulls were vainly hurled at his head, and he was accused of nineteen heresies. On to his death in 1384, Wycliffe zealously pursued his reformations. In his strong advocacy of the absolute authority of Scripture, and in his thorough condemnation of the doctrine of transubstantiation, he sowed seeds which afterwards blossomed and bore fruit. Above all, his translation of the Bible was not only an epoch in the English language, but also an epoch in English life. If England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became "the people of a Book," it must not be forgotten that something of that was due to Wycliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation." The seeds which were sown by Wycliffe were nursed into living energy by Tyndale, Coverdale, Latimer, and Hooper.

4. The mantle of Wycliffe fell upon TYNDALE. He was born in 1484 and died in 1536, ten years before the death of Luther. Tyndale's greatest work was the

[1] See "Solemn League and Covenant" in Appendix III.

translation of the Bible. He is reported at one time to have said to a priest, "If God spare my life, ere many years I shall cause the boy that drives the plough to know more of the Scriptures than you do." God spared his life till his purpose was fulfilled. His translations profoundly influenced English life. They became a living factor in Puritanism. The more Puritanism came to consciousness, the more it laid stress on the authority of Scripture, which, indeed, was the objective principle of the whole Reformation. In the prefaces and prologues attached to the various books of the New Testament, Tyndale laid stress on the sufficiency and authority of Scripture. He stated one of the arguments for Presbyterianism, when he asserted the scriptural identity of Bishop and Presbyter; and when he advocated a simple scriptural form of worship, he was the herald of a plea which Puritanism never ceased to contend or to suffer for. It has been well said that "Tyndale was the true reformer for Great Britain, the man chosen of God to lead a reform which was deeper, more thorough, longer in its sweep, higher in its range, grander in its destiny, than those branches of the Reformation which sprang from Wittenberg and Zürich. For Puritanism had in it a principle of reform, which was the most far-reaching of the principles of the Reformation. . . . It was the destiny of Puritanism to bear the banner of Evangelical progress to loftier heights, long after the Protestantism of the Continent had become stereotyped in various forms of scholasticism" (Briggs, *Presbyterian Review*, October 1884).[1]

5. The work of Tyndale was nobly carried on and developed by COVERDALE; afterwards by LATIMER and

[1] Articles by Dr. Briggs in *Presbyterian Review*, January 1880, October 1883, and October 1884.

HOOPER. In Hooper, Puritan protest first became marked and prominent. Edward VI. had in 1550 nominated him to the see of Gloucester. It appeared, however, that the matter of *clerical vestments* would prove an insuperable obstacle to his acceptance. Cranmer and Ridley endeavoured to remove his scruples; but not till they had consulted with Bucer and Peter Martyr did he see his way to become bishop. Even then, he accepted the office with the discretion of using the vestments, except on public occasions, only as he chose. Thus it is evident that in the reign of Edward VI., Puritan dissent had begun clearly to show itself; and in the Articles of Religion there was stated very clearly the principle on which so much of Puritanism was based: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

6. The matter of *clerical vestments*, just referred to, may be taken as an illustration of the controversies of the time. The position which was taken by Hooper was the position always taken by Puritanism. The Puritan felt and argued that the authority of the word of God was involved, and he did not feel justified in adopting anything in religious worship which was not distinctly authorised by Scripture. Therefore, he argued, the use of vestments was an infringement of the word of God, and, as being opposed to the simplicity of Christian worship, was a temptation to debase the simple and pure fellowship of the soul with God. Besides, was there not a taint of Popery about them? Were they not an infringement of Christian liberty? Were they not provocative of dissension in the body of Christ?

On the other hand, it was argued by the supporters of vestments that the use of them was not specifically condemned by the word of God, and that, after all, no principle was involved. It was also argued that the Church had within it a power of self-government, and might reasonably be guided by tradition and ancient usage. Besides, the time was a most anxious one; the Church of the Reformation had many enemies; and if the use of vestments was in itself indifferent, might it not be granted if by so doing the Romish party could be conciliated and the Throne strengthened? With QUEEN ELIZABETH and her supporters the last point was supreme. The Queen's treatment of Church questions was controlled, partly by considerations of policy, and partly by certain personal characteristics, such as her fondness for display. In any case, the Throne must be supreme; and if Reformation was to proceed, it must be only as in perfect accord with the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy. A Church "tied to the chariot-wheels of the Crown" could never satisfy Puritanism. Elizabeth endeavoured to secure her ends by the Act of Uniformity, the Act of Supremacy, and the Court of High Commission. In 1563 the Thirty-nine Articles were adopted; but into Article XX. the famous clause was inserted: "That the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." Knowing, as we do, the strength and the loyalty of Puritanism, we may well ask, Could any policy have been more fatuous?

7. Queen Elizabeth's policy was heartily seconded by PARKER and WHITGIFT; but it roused the opposition of Puritanism. A reaction set in; questions of Church government, problems touching the very nature of Episcopacy, were thrown into the crucible; out of it emerged NONCONFORMITY. The reaction against the

settled order of Church government showed itself specially in the teaching of THOMAS CARTWRIGHT and ROBERT BROWN. Cartwright is the father of English Presbyterianism. He was born in 1535. In 1569 he began his memorable lectures at Cambridge. These lectures brought Whitgift forward to champion Episcopacy. An idea of Cartwright's teaching may be gathered from the propositions which he handed to the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge while he was there. In these he contends that the names and functions of archbishops and archdeacons should be abolished; that the offices of the lawful ministers of the Church, namely, bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to their apostolical institution, bishops to preach the word of God and pray, deacons to be employed in taking care of the poor; that every Church ought to be governed by its own ministers and presbyters; that ministers ought not to be created by the sole authority of the bishop, but to be openly and fairly chosen by the people. These views were very eloquently defended by Cartwright. As the controversy went on, disputants on both sides became extreme. Presbyterians put forward a plea for the *divine right* (*jus divinum*) of Presbytery; and, on the other hand, a plea was put forward for the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy. This plea grew in intensity, until its most extreme form was advocated by BANCROFT and LAUD. The reaction associated with the name of ROBERT BROWN was of a different character. Congregationalist historians have shown that Brown was led to the views he advocated by a deep disgust at the laxity and corruption of the Episcopalian Church, especially in the matter of the Lord's Supper. He held that, in the light of such laxity and corruption, there was no alternative but *separation*. He maintained that any company of believers formed in

themselves a true Church; that any member was at liberty to preach and exhort; and that in the Lord's Supper care must be taken to exclude unworthy members. Brown is the father of INDEPENDENCY in England. Whatever the violence and the virulence of the *Separatists* to begin with, as, for example, in the notorious *Marprelate* tracts, it is certainly true that liberty of conscience owes much to them.

8. The elements of dissatisfaction, dissent, and protest, which we have indicated, ultimately issued in the WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY. Schaff is right when he tells us that "the excesses of despotism, sacerdotalism, ceremonialism, intolerance, and cruelty exhausted the patience of a noble, freedom-loving people, and kindled the blazing war-torch which burnt to the ground the throne and the temple" (*History of Creeds*, p. 718). And this becomes clearer when we study the movements of the reign of KING JAMES. He came to the throne in 1603. In Scotland, where James had reigned since 1578, the political element in the Reformation had been subordinate to the religious, and the commanding personality of JOHN KNOX had left an indelible impress. The form of Church government had been *a stormy Presbyterianism.* At the same time, it is well to remember that Knox did not contemplate a *jus divinum* Presbyterianism. In Article XX. of the Scotch Confession of 1560, the important statement occurs: "Not that we think that any policie and an ordour in ceremonies can be appoynted for al ages, times, and places: for as ceremonies, sik as men have devised, ar but temporall; so may and aucht they to be changed, when they rather foster superstition then that they edify the Kirk using the same." Subsequent controversy, however, developed a *jus divinum* Presbyterianism, and it received a robust expression from ANDREW

MELVILLE. In their controversies, the Presbyterians got little sympathy from King James, of whom Rawson Gardiner has truly said, "When the temple of a man's heart is empty, he becomes unconsciously a worshipper of himself." Presbyterianism was too democratic for a Stuart king, and when James succeeded to the English throne he welcomed the change, and hoped to be delivered there from Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick, from rough and straight speech, and from sleeve-pulling! He hoped to govern England and to govern its Church, as a king should; and his policy he put into an aphorism, "No Bishop, no King," by which he meant primarily the divine right of kings, *afterward* the divine right of bishops! His aphorism, congenial to himself, and still more congenial to his son, led both to a conflict —such indeed as they had little anticipated.

9. The state of feeling among the Puritans and the ecclesiastical situation in England are very clearly shown in the proceedings of the HAMPTON COURT conference, which was held during three days of January 1604. The conference was a symptom of the disorder and unsettlement of the time. It was presided over by King James—a congenial task. There were present on the one side, Archbishop Whitgift, with eight bishops and eight deans; and on the other, four eminent and moderate Puritans, of whom the saintly Dr. JOHN REYNOLDS was leader. In his opening speech King James thanked God that he had been brought "into the promised land, where religion is purely professed." On the second day of the proceedings, Reynolds, when permitted to speak, put the demands of the Puritans under four heads: (1) that the doctrine of the Church might be preserved in purity, according to God's word; (2) that good pastors might be planted in all churches

to preach the same; (3) that the Church government might be sincerely ministered according to God's word; (4) that the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety. These demands were put very moderately by Reynolds. The High Church party were determined to concede nothing, and their intolerance in the conference was amazing. They knew, however, that they had the support of the King, who practically refused to argue the matter of ceremonies, such as the cross in baptism or the wearing of the surplice. On these matters the Puritan felt keenly, not merely because they had no authority in the word of God, but because the imposition of them was an infringement of his liberty. The second day of the conference ended in a very coarse scene. "Well, Doctor," said the King, "have you anything else to say?" "No more," replied Dr. Reynolds, "if it please your Majesty." His Majesty, "If that be all your party have to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse." The third day of this fruitless conference was spent chiefly in the giving and receiving of flatteries, the most fulsome on record. "I protest," said the Bishop of London; "my heart melteth with joy that Almighty God, of His singular mercy, hath given us such a king, as since Christ's time the like hath not been!" (Fuller, *Church History*, vol. iii. p. 190). The conference was not absolutely barren, for we owe to it the Authorised Version of 1611; but so far as the troubles of the Puritans were concerned, there was no relief. This was shown conclusively in the same year, when the Convocation prepared *Canons Ecclesiastical*, the result of the imposition of these being that many hundreds of ministers were silenced and deprived of their charges.

10. When CHARLES I. came to the throne in 1625, things went from bad to worse. There was liberty neither in Church nor in State. The King, who was constitutionally a tyrant, was supported in the State by STRAFFORD, whose policy was "Thorough," and in the Church by LAUD, who was constitutionally a pope. The result was "political and ecclesiastical absolutism." From 1629 to 1640 there was no Parliament. The Star Chamber and the High Commission Court were supreme. Ecclesiastically, the Puritan demands for reformation in doctrine, discipline, government, and worship were ignored. The leaders of the Puritan revolt were silenced, imprisoned, fined, or done to death. The consequence was that everywhere in England indignation, contempt, and ridicule broke forth. Puritanism was on all sides in revolt against the High Church party, driven everywhere into NONCONFORMITY, into Presbyterianism, Independency, Sectarianism. What was the end to be? Clearly, the established order was doomed. England was in a dangerous state. Its Church had lost hold of the people, who in turn were burning with indignation when they saw their best men persecuted, and leaders such as Prynne, Leighton, Bastwick, and Burton most cruelly mutilated.

11. The first blow was struck by Scotland. Since the Act of 1592, which has been well called, notwithstanding its shortcomings, "the charter of Presbyterianism" in Scotland, the substance, if not the form of Church government, had been Presbyterian. James tried very hard to reimpose Episcopacy, more especially after he had become king in the blessed "land of promise, where religion was so purely professed." But it was a mongrel Episcopacy. The machinery of Presbyterianism continued: above all, the affections of the people

clung to Presbyterian forms and the liberty of Assemblies. When King James tried to deprive the people of these, he simply alienated the people from himself. All that he succeeded in securing was practically this, that Assemblies could not be held without his permission, and that his bishops should be constant moderators of presbyteries. When he tried to do more, as, for instance, to enforce the notorious Articles of Perth (1618), he met with opposition, sometimes silent, but always strenuous. The people would not have their worship or forms of Church government dictated to them. This became still more evident in the reign of Charles I. The people of Scotland resented his absolutism, and his government of their Church by divine right. They would allow no *jus divinum* to regulate the affairs of Christ's Church. Charles visited Scotland in 1633. His order then, that clerical vestments should be resumed, was a warning of what was to follow. In 1636 he sent down a Book of Canons which ignored Assemblies, and in effect practically abolished Presbyterianism. In 1637 he sent down a LITURGY, which was meant to supersede Knox's. The Scottish people saw in this an infringement of their Christian liberty. In the Liturgy itself they detected the evil influence of Laud, and suspected a tendency Romeward. The Liturgy was the spark which set Scotland in a blaze. When it was introduced in July 1637 in St. Giles' Cathedral, riots immediately took place. The Government was powerless; and national authority passed into the hands of the TABLES. On February 28th, 1638, the NATIONAL COVENANT (Confession of 1581 with additions) was signed, and on the 21st of November the GENERAL ASSEMBLY was convened at Glasgow.

12. "Thus," says Fuller, "none seeing it now foul

weather in Scotland could expect it fair sunshine in England" (*Church History*, iii. 404). The King's troubles in England, Ireland, and Scotland, particularly his troubles with Scotland, compelled him at last to summon Parliament. The SHORT PARLIAMENT met on April 13th, 1640. The King quickly dissolved it when he saw the temper of the people's representatives. But the march of events went beyond the King's control, and on November 3rd the LONG PARLIAMENT met. For the King, the situation was becoming desperate. Away in the North the Scottish troops were gaining one success after another. Their influence was contagious, and the Puritans in England were determined to have their grievances redressed—liberty for conscience, and reform in worship, government, and doctrine. The Long Parliament, under the leadership of PYM, quickly set to work. Constitutional reform was its first concern. The Star Chamber and the High Commission Court were abolished. It was made clear, once for all, that no government could be constitutional which ignored the voice of the people, as represented in Parliament. Events followed with bewildering rapidity. Laud was imprisoned, Strafford executed. In November 1641, Pym appealed to the nation in the GRAND REMONSTRANCE. Civil war became inevitable, and both sides began to intrigue with Scotland and its army (cf. Hume Brown, *History of Scotland*, ii. 323 f.).

13. The CHURCH QUESTION was naturally also in the forefront; and it is with the Church Question that we have now to deal. Immediately after the meeting of the Long Parliament, both Houses appointed COMMITTEES OF RELIGION. Though the Committee appointed by the House of Commons did good work, it is not so famous as the Lords' Committee. Over it presided the versatile

Williams, Bishop of Lincoln and Dean of Westminster. The Committee had power "to send for what learned divines their Lordships shall please for their better information." We shall meet the names of many of these afterwards. Ussher and Twisse were there; also the more High Church bishop, Hall. The conference ended in smoke. Perhaps, this was unavoidable when such spirits as Williams, Hall, and the famous Smectymnuan divines sat round the same table. Robert Baillie regards the conference "as a trick of the bishops." Fuller, on the other hand, thinks something might have come out of it. "Some are of opinion," he says, "that the moderation and mutual compliance of these divines might have produced much good, if not interrupted; conceiving such lopping might have saved the falling of Episcopacy." But the feeling was abroad that Laudianism was dead or dying. To revive it was a hopeless task. Those who were in favour of Episcopacy were in favour of a *modified* form, and in Parliament there were many who advocated that. Opposed to them was "the root and branch" party. As a whole, this party desired the complete overthrowal of Episcopacy, the substitution of some other form of Church government, and the preparation of new standards. The majority of this party were in favour of Presbyterianism. They had the support and the counsel of Scottish Commissioners, who were in London from November 1640 to June 1641.

14. In the Grand Remonstrance, December 1641, the need of reformation and the idea of a Synod were very prominent. The suggestion, indeed, was made "of a General Synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines *of this island*, assisted by some from foreign parts." Is there not a hint here that, in such a

Synod representatives from Scotland might have a part? Scotland certainly desired that the benefits of Presbyterianism should be extended to England. In the Scottish Assembly of August 1641, Henderson had urged the drawing up of "a Confession of Faith, a Catechism, a Directory for all the parts of the public worship, and a Platform of Government, *wherein possibly England and we might agree.*"[1] The carrying out of his suggestion, however, was interrupted by the idea of the General Synod, which greatly fascinated the Scottish divines. This idea was meantime gradually taking shape. On April 19th, 1642, the House of Commons ordered that "the names of such divines as shall be thought fit to be consulted with concerning the matter of the Church, be brought in to-morrow morning." By the 1st of June a Bill had passed both Houses "for calling an Assembly of godly and learned divines to be consulted with by the Parliament for the settling of the government and liturgy of the Church, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from false aspersions and interpretations." Nothing was wanting now but the King's consent. This was withheld, and, indeed, was never given. In October a second Bill was brought in, and in December a third. But Parliament was not to be mocked. Though the refusal of the King to sanction the Synod was unfortunate, involving as it probably would the absence of the Episcopal party, greater and weightier considerations prevailed, and at last, on June 12th, 1643, an Ordinance calling the Assembly was finally passed. On the 1st of July the WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY was a great reality.

[1] Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, i. 365. He describes this as "a notable motion."

CHAPTER II.

CALLING, CONSTITUTION, AND CHARACTER OF THE ASSEMBLY.

SECTIONS 15–26.

15. Was this a proper Synod? Objections answered.
16. Members were selected by Parliament.
17. Were the members a representative selection? State of parties.
18. Views of critics of the Assembly.
19. The state of Scholarship in the Assembly.
20. State of Scholarship (*continued*). The Independents.
21. John Selden.
22. Preachers in the Assembly.
23. The Scottish Commissioners: Alexander Henderson.
24. Robert Baillie and Samuel Rutherfurd.
25. George Gillespie.
26. The Assembly was not a commonplace gathering.

CHAPTER II.

CALLING, CONSTITUTION, AND CHARACTER OF THE ASSEMBLY.

15. When we begin to consider the Westminster Assembly and its proceedings, a number of questions arise which require some answer. It has been objected to the Assembly that it was not a real *Synod*, because, first of all, it was called by *State* authority; and, secondly, it did not receive *Royal* sanction. It is clear that these objections come from two very different parties. But it has to be remembered that in England the State had authority to convene ecclesiastical assemblages. The 21st Article of the Church of England said that "General Councils may not be gathered together but by the commandment and will of princes." In the present case, Parliament was obliged to assume Crown prerogatives. The times were exceptional; and though it is quite true that the Assembly never had Royal sanction, it is also true that in a crisis such as then was in England, this would be no objection to the validity of the Synod. When the Crown failed, Parliament had no alternative. It may be said, again, that the powers of the Assembly were of a very limited character; that, indeed, it was only *an advisory Council*. Robert Baillie remarks, apparently with a sigh, that "This is no proper Assemblie, but a meeting called by the Parliament to advyse them in what things they are asked" (*Letters*,

ii. 186). Of course, the Westminster Assembly was not "a proper Assembly," like the Scottish Assembly, which was Baillie's ideal. In the nature of the case that was impossible, as the Assembly was meeting *for the purpose of deliberating on what form of Church government should be established.* The circumstances were practically parallel to those in England in 1553, when the Forty-two Articles were drawn up at the request of Edward VI.; or to those in Scotland in 1560, when, at the request of Parliament, John Knox and his coadjutors drew up a Confession of Faith and a Book of Discipline. The Assembly was an advisory body; but its powers were great. Parliament was sympathetic, and there was a common bond of Puritan brotherhood. "The Westminster Assembly," says Masson, "is to be borne in mind as a power or institution in the English realm, existing side by side with the Long Parliament, and in constant conference and co-operation with it" (*Life of Milton*, ii. 574).

16. The Ordinance for calling the Assembly, as printed June 20th, 1643, contains the names of twenty members of the House of Commons, ten members of the House of Lords, and a hundred and twenty-one divines. How were these divines appointed? "Parliament," says Fuller, "thought it not fit to intrust the clergy with their own choice, of whose general corruption they constantly complained; and therefore adjudged it unfit that the distempered patients should be, or choose their own physicians" (*History*, ii. 446). The divines, therefore, seem to have been chosen by the members who represented the counties and boroughs in England and Wales. Each member chose or recommended two divines; the Welsh members, however, selecting only one. These names were read over and passed by the House of Com-

mons; and it is important to note that at least three names were put to the vote. This disposes of the gibe in which, for example, Milton, in his later want of sympathy with Presbyterianism, indulged: "Only as each member of Parliament in his private fancy thought fit, so elected one by one" (cf. Schaff, *History of Creeds*, p. 729).

17. But this raises a much more important question, were the members of the Assembly a thoroughly representative selection? Now, in reply to that question, it must be remembered that Parliament *intended* the selection of divines to be representative. If the Episcopalian section did not see their way to be present on account of the refusal of Royal sanction, the blame, surely, is not to be laid at the door of Parliament! Fuller has correctly described the Assembly as "a quintessence of four parties." (1) EPISCOPALIANS were included in the Ordinance calling the Assembly. Among these were Ussher, Brownrigg, Prideaux, and Featley. With the exception of Featley, these took no part in the Assembly's proceedings, though, in a very true sense, it may be said that Ussher was present all through. (2) There were PRESBYTERIANS. These were the largest section in the Assembly. They were not of one mind. Some advocated a Presbytery of divine right, others of expediency. The *shibboleth* of the one party was the *jus divinum;* the *shibboleth* of the other the *jus humanum* of Presbyterianism. On the one side were prominent the Smectymnuans [1] (Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young,

[1] The name is curious. In the war of pamphlets before the Assembly met there was published (March 1641) a small quarto in reply to Bishop Hall's *Humble Remonstrance*. The book was written by "Smectymnuus." The name was odd, and caught the popular fancy. It was formed, of course, from the initials of the five Presbyterian ministers whose names are given above.

Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow), who were afterwards to be greatly aided by the Scottish Commissioners; and, on the other, were such men as Twisse, Gataker, and Palmer. (3) There were the INDEPENDENTS. The five leading members were Goodwin, Nye, Burroughes, Bridge, and Simpson. This party, though small, was extremely influential. (4) Finally, there were ERASTIANS. The two Erastian divines were very eminent men, Coleman and Lightfoot. Co-operating with these, however, was Selden; and the party had a commanding influence in the House of Commons. Such was the state of parties as arranged in the Ordinance of Parliament. It was certainly unfortunate, in view of the many issues at stake, that the Episcopalian Royalist divines did not attend. "What speedier way," says Thomas Fuller, "to make peace in a distracted Church, than to take in all interests to consult together?" There was at the time a considerable feeling of regret over the absence of "the defenders of the hierarchy" (Fuller, *Church History*, iii. 449).

18. Critics of the Westminster Assembly have not been at one in estimating the qualifications of the members. Some have been of opinion that the best available men were not chosen. Others, as for instance Clarendon, have been prejudiced in their estimate. Clarendon admits that there were "a few very reverend and worthy persons." But he goes on to say, "some were infamous in their lives and conversations, and most of them of very mean parts, if not of scandalous ignorance; and of no other reputation but of malice to the Church of England." MILTON, alienated from the Presbyterians over the matter of divorce, describes the Assembly as "a certain number of divines, neither chosen by any rule or custom ecclesiastical, nor eminent for either piety or know-

ledge above others left out." Formerly, his tone about the Assembly had been different: "a learned and memorable Synod" in which "piety, learning, and prudence were housed." It has also been more recently asserted (as, for instance, by Principal Fairbairn, *Contemp. Review*, vol. xxi.), that there were greater men out of than in the Assembly, and that the quieter spirits were left outside. On the other hand, Richard Baxter, who had unrivalled opportunities for knowing, has said: "The divines there congregated were men of eminent learning and godliness, ministerial ability and fidelity." The five dissenting brethren, who were members of the Assembly, in their notorious "Apologetical Narration"[1] tell us that it was "an Assembly of many able, learned, and grave divines, where much of the piety, wisdom, and learning of the two kingdoms were met in one." Hallam has a well-known testimony: "They (the Assembly divines) were, perhaps, equal in learning, good sense, and other merits to any Lower House of Convocation that ever made a figure in Europe" (*Constitutional History of England*, p. 430, ed. 1870).

19. If we study the list of membership,[2] we shall find that there were in the Assembly some of the most gifted men in England of their day. Amongst the ministers were such scholars as Twisse, Reynolds, Gataker, Calamy, Lightfoot, Coleman, Seaman, Arrowsmith, Tuckney, Hoyle, and the Independents; or such preachers as Marshall, Gouge, Calamy, Palmer, Burroughes, Greenhill, Caryl, and Goodwin. Amongst the laymen were such men as Selden, Vane, Whitelocke, and St. John. It may be said without prejudice that these were all famous men. Some of them had and still have a European reputation. Twisse of Newbury was a speculative genius, whose

[1] See p. 69. [2] See Appendix II.

reputation at the time was European. His *Riches of God's Love* and his *Vindiciæ gratiæ potestatis ac providentiæ Dei* were great books. His power as a controversialist was universally acknowledged, and Arminianism in particular had reason to know his subtle logic. His contemporaries have spoken highly of him. Fuller, for instance, in his *Worthies of England* calls him "a divine of great abilities, learning, piety, and moderation." "His plain preaching," he says, "was good, his disputing better, his pious living best of all." "Good with the trowel, but better with the sword, more happy in polemical divinity than edifying doctrine." Twisse, as we shall see, was made Prolocutor of the Assembly, and in this connection Robert Baillie has a well-known passage about him: "The man, as the world knows, is very learned in the questions he hes studied, and very good, beloved of all, and highlie esteemed; but merelie bookish, and not much, as it seems, acquaint with conceived prayer [and] among the unfittest of all the company for any action; so, after the prayer he sitts mute. It was the canny convoyance of those who guides most matters for their own interest to plant such a man of purpose in the chaire." Such was the man who presided over the Assembly—profoundly learned, earnest, and moderate. On his death (July 1646), Herle became Prolocutor. He was Rector of Winwick in Lancashire. In the Assembly he proved himself a very active and useful member. Fuller describes him thus: "One so much Christian scholar and gentleman that he can unite in affection with those who are disjoined in judgment with him" (iii. 467).

20. The doctrinal standpoint of the members generally was Calvinism; but the members were not all such high Calvinist and supra-lapsarians as Twisse. Some were

moderate Calvinists, and we shall find that some, notably Calamy, adopted a liberal view on the extent of the Atonement. The scholarship of the Assembly was unchallenged. Some members were great HEBREW SCHOLARS, such as Selden, Lightfoot, Coleman, and Seaman. The last named was a keen controversialist and a practised debater. Coleman was known familiarly as "Rabbi Coleman," and the great scholarship of Lightfoot was unquestioned. No New Testament scholar can think of his *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ* without acknowledgment of its vast learning and research. There were many members equally distinguished for their GREEK SCHOLARSHIP. Gataker, for instance, was a close friend of Ussher and Selden, and ranked with them as among the finest Greek scholars of his day. His dissertation on the "Style of New Testament Greek" is a landmark in the researches of scholars into the peculiar character of New Testament Greek. The INDEPENDENTS, also, were very notable men. The works of Goodwin are a treasure-house of spiritual truth. In power of exposition he was probably excelled by no other Puritan. "His writings," says Stoughton, "present him to us as an accomplished theologian and a many-sided thinker, and show that scarcely any forms of thought in metaphysical divinity escaped his notice" (*Ecclesiastical History of England*, also article in Schaff-Herzog). Burroughes and Greenhill were known as "the morning and evening stars of Stepney." Burroughes is the author of a commentary on *Hosea*, the original edition of which is in four volumes *folio*! Greenhill wrote a commentary on *Ezekiel*, the first edition of which is in five quarto volumes. Nye, Bridge, and Simpson were also distinguished Independents. Philip Nye was a politician and an ecclesiastic, and he ranks as one of the "patriarchs

of English Independency." Caryl, another Independent, was the author of *An Exposition with Practical Observations on the Book of Job.* The exposition ran into twelve volumes quarto, and has been described as "an excellent school of its chief topic, the virtue of patience" (Schaff).

21. Of the lay members, the greatest was undoubtedly SELDEN. King James was described, by one of his flatterers at the Hampton Court Conference, as "a living library and a walking study." The description would have been true of Selden. His contemporaries regarded him with profound admiration; and in the Assembly there was no greater honour than to have successfully broken a lance with John Selden. In points of pure theology there were men in the Assembly more learned than he; but when questions arose as to language, law, antiquity, or precedent, Selden was practically master of the situation! At the same time, it is probable that in the Assembly he came to be over-fond of propounding difficulties to the divines, of whom it must be confessed he was *not* over-fond; and the severe remark of Thomas Fuller has considerable truth in it: "Some stick not to say that those who will not feed on the flesh of God's word cast most bones to others, to break their teeth therewith."

22. There were, also, great preachers in the Assembly. Perhaps the greatest of these was STEPHEN MARSHALL. Baillie calls him "the best preacher in England." In the Westminster Assembly he took a very prominent place, and was leader of the Presbyterians. Another famous preacher was "gracious and learned little PALMER" (Baillie), of *Catechism* fame. GOUGE, also, must be mentioned. For the long period of thirty-five years he lectured in Blackfriars; and, according to Brook, "so great was his fame that, when religious persons from

distant parts of the country went to London, they did not think their business finished unless they had attended Blackfriars' Lecture" (*Lives of the Puritans*). His commentary on *Hebrews*, in two folio volumes, is of permanent value. In addition to all these scholars and preachers, there have to be mentioned the SCOTTISH COMMISSIONERS, who joined the Assembly a few months after it opened. As we shall see, they came up to take part in the proceedings of the Assembly after the adoption of the "Solemn League and Covenant." It will help to complete our picture of the men who took part in the Assembly's work, if at this point we say something about these Commissioners. There were eight of them altogether, five ministers and three laymen; but the constant Scottish quantity may be said to have been Henderson, Baillie, Rutherfurd, and Gillespie.

23. Everyone knows something of the history of ALEXANDER HENDERSON, the ecclesiastical statesman who, perhaps, ranks next to John Knox in our Scottish history. For eighteen years he had prepared himself for coming days in the quiet parish of Leuchars. The suicidal actions of Charles I. called him from his retirement; and from 1638 on to his death in 1646, he was in a very true sense the political genius of his nation. Preacher, statesman, wise in word, cautious in action; trusted and consulted by great and small, both in Scotland and in England; a power in the Assembly, honoured as none other with high debate and keen argument with King Charles himself—such was Henderson. True, he did not venture much on the wide sea of authorship; but there were few important papers that did not, in some way or other, pass through his hands; and in the "National Covenant" of 1638, and the "Solemn League and Covenant" of 1643, he has left imperishable memo-

rials. In 1641 he published a little work on *The Order and Government of the Church of Scotland.* When the "Directory for Church Government" was being drawn up in 1645, Henderson made use of this pamphlet.[1]

24. Robert Baillie is a most interesting character. This arises largely from the unique nature of his *Letters and Journals.* No one who has ever had occasion to use the three piquant volumes will fail to acknowledge their extraordinary freshness, vivacity, and accuracy. Baillie in 1631 had become minister of Kilwinning in Ayrshire, and in 1642—just when he was forty—professor at Glasgow. In 1640 his literary activity may be said to have begun. Before the Westminster Assembly met he had published four rather important quartos; but it was in 1645, about the middle of the Assembly's activity, that he issued the largest work he had published up to that date, *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time.* The work was dedicated to "The Earle of Lauderdaile, Lord Metelane." It is not necessary to specify his other works. He has left this on record of himself: "I have neither a mind nor great fitness to

[1] The author confesses to a strong feeling that Alexander Henderson has not come to his own in Scottish Church History. Masson (*Life of Milton*, iii. 16) expresses his conviction that "he was, all in all, one of the ablest and best men of his age in Britain, and the greatest, the wisest, and most liberal of the Scottish Presbyterians." Masson also expresses regret that Henderson has never received justice in general British history. The materials for his life in its first part are unfortunately very scanty, but the second part of his life is practically the history of the period. There are *Lives* by M'Crie and Aiton. From a luminous appreciation by Dr. G. Webster Thomson, Aberdeen, this may be quoted: "No one of her sons has ever served Scotland and the Church of Scotland with more modesty and more entire unselfishness, with greater diligence and fidelity, and few, indeed, with more ability."

appear in print; yet it hes been my fortune much oftener than I thought to come out in this kind" (ii. p. 385). As for his colleague, SAMUEL RUTHERFURD, his memory is to-day as fresh and green as ever. Learned to a fault, great in debate, quaintest of preachers, most spiritual of men, Rutherfurd possessed in combination gifts, any one of which is enough to make men famous. The Westminster Assembly called out his powers as an author. Before that event his career is marked particularly by his imprisonment at Aberdeen (1636–38), and the *Letters* he sent from that city. During the sittings of the Assembly, Rutherfurd published the *Due Right of Presbyteries* (1644), *Lex Rex* in the same year, and the *Divine Right of Church Government*, called forth by Erastian debates in the Assembly (1646).

25. But the most phenomenal of these four Commissioners was GEORGE GILLESPIE. When the Assembly met, he was little more than thirty; in five years his meteoric career had closed. In that short time his work was done, and wonderfully done. "With the fire of youth he had the wisdom of age." How one pictures this youthful stripling doing battle with John Selden![1] There was something preternatural in Gillespie's first literary venture. At the time he was in the household of the Earl of Cassilis. The kingdom was convulsed with the Laudian innovations; and just at that moment (in 1637) Gillespie published his *Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Church of Scotland*. It was a wonderful book for a youth of twenty-four, and the interest which it raised was considerably heightened by the fact that it was anonymous. Baillie reflects the general admiration in his *Letters*.

[1] He described himself on one occasion, as he squeezed his way into the Assembly, as a "pinning."

After adverting to the *Reasons against the Service* (which he had taken to be by Henderson, but which he had found was by Gillespie), he adds: "This same youth is now given out also by those that should know for the author of the English-Popish Ceremonies; whereof we all doe marvell; for though he had gotten the papers, and help of the chief of that syde, yet the very composition would seem to be farre above such an age; bot if that book be truely of his making, I admire the man, though I mislyke much of his matter; yea, I think he may prove amongst the best witts of this Isle" (i. 90). We shall find that Baillie never had cause to change this judgment; rather, his admiration ever increased. In the meantime, however, Baillie was not quite sure about this rising star. So, somewhat later on, in his *Letters* we find the following: "A prettie schollar, Mr G., bot too rash in his determinations, if I conceave him right in manie things" (i. 189). As Baillie came into more intimate intercourse with "the youth," his opinion about the "determinations" changed very considerably. Gillespie's subsequent writings are chiefly his *Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland* (1641), mainly anti-independent—and his *magnum opus*, *Aaron's Rod-Blossoming; or, The Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated*, published in 1646, the same year as Rutherfurd's work, and the outcome of the same Erastian controversy. The title has often been regarded as peculiar; but no one questions the ability of the work. Dr. William Cunningham, indeed, has said in his *Historical Theology* that Gillespie's work is the best for studying the historical aspects of Erastianism. Another of Gillespie's works is of great importance for the history of the Westminster Assembly, namely, his *Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines* . . .

February 1644 to January 1645." These notes, taken principally during the great debates on Presbytery, in which Gillespie himself played a prominent part, largely supplement Lightfoot's *Journal*.[1]

26. When one considers the character and membership of the Westminster Assembly, one finds it difficult to regard as otherwise than vain or prejudiced the idea that this was a second-rate or commonplace gathering. Undoubtedly there were many very learned men in England who might have had a place in the membership, and whose contributions to the work and influence of the Assembly might have been of the greatest value. Many did not find it in their conscience to attend, because of the refusal of the King to sanction the gathering. But there were others, such as John Owen and Richard Baxter, whose presence in the Assembly would have been a distinct gain. Yet, after all, it is not easy to see how the doctrinal conclusions reached by the Assembly could have been much otherwise than they came to be; and it is equally difficult to determine whether the presence of certain prominent men, who were not members, would have led matters concerning *Church Government* to any more satisfactory result. It may be confidently asserted that for ten men outside the Assembly there were twenty inside just as able in every way to cope with difficulties in government and in doctrine. After all, one of the best ways to judge the ability and scholarship in the Assembly is to read the record of its debates. Anyone who takes the trouble to read the debates on 1 Cor. xii. 28, Rom. xii. 8, 1 Tim. v. 17, as

[1] Valuable information about these Scottish Commissioners, and particularly the lay members, will be found in such recent works as Morison's *Johnston of Warriston* (Famous Scots Series), and Willcock, *The Great Marquess*.

given in Lightfoot's *Journal*, or Gillespie's notes on the question of Presbytery, or Selden's Erastian speeches,—*e.g.* on Matt. xviii. 17,—will be quickly dispossessed of flippant ideas of Westminster scholarship. We may echo the words of Matthew Newcomen in his sermon before the Assembly, 7th July 1643, "Verily, I have often from my heart wished that your greatest adversaries and traducers might be witnesses of your learned, grave, and pious debates" (cf. Mitchell, *Westminster Assembly*, p. 139).

CHAPTER III.

SCOPE OF THE ASSEMBLY'S DELIBERATIONS AND FIRST WORK.

SECTIONS 27–33.

27. The Assembly was an advisory body.
28. Extracts from Parliament's Ordinance, calling the Assembly.
29. First days of work.
30. Division into Committees.
31. Revision of Thirty-nine Articles.
32. "The Four Bills," 1648. Changes in Articles.
33. History of Fifteen revised Articles.

CHAPTER III.

SCOPE OF THE ASSEMBLY'S DELIBERATIONS AND FIRST WORK.

27. It has been said already that the Assembly was purely *advisory*. Parliament took rigid control of the Assembly's work. It settled the general subjects for discussion, and when the Assembly reached conclusions, these were not authoritative until sanctioned by Parliament. This will be clear from a few extracts from Parliament's Ordinance: (1) "Whereas it hath been declared and resolved by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that the present Church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending upon the hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation and growth of religion, and very prejudicial to the state and government of this kingdom." (2) "Therefore they are resolved that the same shall be taken away, and *that such a government shall be settled in the Church as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad.*" (3) "And, for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit and

necessary to call an Assembly of learned, godly, and judicious divines, who, together with some members of both the Houses of Parliament, are to consult and advise of such matters and things, touching the premises, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and to give their advice and counsel therein to both or either of the said Houses, when and as often as they shall be thereunto appointed." (4) Then follows this instruction for the members of Assembly, "to meet and assemble themselves at WESTMINSTER, in the chapel called King Henry the VII.'s Chapel, on the first day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and forty-three; and, after the first meeting, being at least of the number of forty, shall from time to time sit, and be removed from place to place; and also that the said Assembly shall be dissolved in such manner as by both Houses of Parliament shall be directed."

28. Then the Ordinance proceeds to give an instruction to the members of Assembly "to confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things, touching and concerning *the Liturgy, Discipline, and Government of the Church of England* . . . as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the said Houses of Parliament, and by no other." Dr. William Twisse is, then, appointed Prolocutor of Assembly. The instruction about difference of opinion is interesting: "And in case any difference of opinion shall happen, among the said persons so assembled, touching any the matters that shall be proposed to them as aforesaid, that then they shall represent the same, together with the reasons thereof, to both or either the said Houses respectively, to the end such further direction may be given therein as shall be requisite in that behalf." Further, "for the charges and

expenses of the said divines . . . there shall be allowed unto every of them . . . the sum of four shillings for every day," and they are to be freed from all penalties, loans, or damages arising from their absence from their several charges. The Ordinance closes with these words: "Provided always, That this Ordinance, or anything therein contained, shall not give unto the persons aforesaid, or any of them, nor shall they in this Assembly assume to exercise any jurisdiction, power, or authority ecclesiastical whatsoever, or any other power than is herein particularly expressed."[1]

29. The Assembly met on July 1st, 1643, and continued its normal sittings until February 22nd, 1649. At the first meeting there were present sixty-nine members. The Prolocutor, Dr. Twisse, delivered an opening sermon on John xiv. 18, "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come unto you." There was no particular work as yet before the Assembly; so it adjourned till Thursday, July 6th. In the interval, Parliament ordered "that the Assembly, in their beginning, in the first place, shall take the ten first Articles of the Church of England into their consideration, to vindicate them from all false doctrine and heresy." On the 6th of July the Assembly again met, and Lightfoot tells us that certain rules of procedure were brought in from the two Houses of Parliament. There were eight rules in all. In effect, they provided that two assessors and two scribes or clerks should be appointed, the latter not members of Assembly, namely, Henry Roborough and Adoniram Byfield; that every member should make a solemn promise to maintain only what he believed to be the truth; that Scripture should be required as proof; that dissent should be allowed; and that all things agreed on by the

[1] See Ordinance in full, Appendix I.

majority should be sent up to the Houses of Parliament—with reasons of dissent if the minority so desired. Friday the 7th was a day of prayer. Appropriate sermons were delivered by Oliver Bowles and the Smectymnuan Newcomen, in which the divines were exhorted to consider carefully and prayerfully the importance of their meeting. "Yea," said Bowles, "ages to come will either bless or curse you, as you shall follow or neglect the opportunity." Next day the Assembly met, and the following protestation was made by every member: "I, A. B., do seriously and solemnly protest, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly, whereof I am a member, I will not maintain anything in matters of doctrine but what I think in my conscience to be truth; or in point of discipline but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the glory of God and the good and peace of His Church" (Lightfoot, *Journal*, p. 4).

30. At the same session, the members were divided into three *committees*, and among them the first ten of the Thirty-nine Articles were distributed. The lists of members of committee need not be given in full, but it may be mentioned that in the first committee were Hoyle, Bridge, Goodwin, Gouge, White, Marshall, Nye, Smith, and Burgess (convener); in the second committee, Burroughes, Calamy, Caryl, Seaman, Reynolds, Arrowsmith, and Stanton (convener); in the third, Simpson, Vines, Greenhill, Temple, Ashe, Gataker, Spurstow, Newcomen, Gibbon (convener). The committees were open, and anyone might attend them. The work was prepared in these committees and then laid before the Assembly for discussion. At this meeting of Assembly, assessors were appointed to assist the Prolocutor, namely, "the Patriarch" White of Dorchester, and Dr. Cornelius Burgess. In order that the com-

mittees might have ample time to discuss and prepare their work, the Assembly adjourned till Wednesday, July 12th. On that day, Burgess as convener of the first committee made a report; but from Lightfoot we learn that very little was done on that day except "a great debate,"—"whether in our proceeding upon all the Articles we should produce Scripture for the clearing of them." This subject, he adds, "held debating all the forenoon, but at last was resolved affirmatively" (*Journal*, p. 5).

31. From July 12th on to October 12th the Assembly debated the Thirty-nine Articles, and by the latter date had finished the revision of fifteen. The debates over these Articles were of considerable importance; and one has difficulty in giving more than a qualified assent to the remark of Masson, that "these first weeks of the Assembly's pains over the Articles of the Church were to be labour wasted" (*Milton*, iii. 6). Certainly there was no direct or permanent result; but the labours of these weeks were, surely, far from *wasted!* The debates involved cardinal points of doctrine, and, as they proceeded, not merely was clearness of vision obtained, but indications of an unmistakable character were given in regard to the feeling and trend of thought of sections in the Assembly. There can be little doubt that when the Confession of Faith came to be framed, these early debates conduced to clearness and conciseness in discussion.

32. During the negotiations of Parliament with the King in 1648, there were sent to him in the Isle of Wight certain documents, which appeared in a small tract (published March 20th, 1647–48) of forty-six pages, with the title, "The Four Bills, sent to the King to the Isle of Wight to be passed." One of these documents

is the revision, up to Article XV., of the Thirty-nine Articles. It is not, however, the revision as it came from the Assembly, but the revision as afterwards adjusted and passed by Parliament. There are a few points of difference between the revision as sent up by the Assembly and the revision as passed by Parliament. One minor point is in Article II. In the 1630 edition of the Thirty-nine Articles (printed in "The Four Bills"), Christ is described as suffering "for the actuall sinnes of men," the "all" before "actual" being omitted, though it had kept its place from the original edition of the Articles down to 1628. It appears that in the Assembly's revision the "all" was also omitted; but in the Article, as passed by Parliament, the "all" is restored, thus bringing the Article into line with the thoroughly Calvinistic Irish Articles of 1615. The most important point of difference, however, is in regard to Article VIII. In the 1630 edition of the Thirty-nine Articles, Article VIII. is as follows: "The three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture." In the revised text of 1648, as passed by Parliament and presented to the King, *this Article is quite omitted.* We should not have expected this. Lightfoot in his *Journal*, under date August 18th, 1643, tells us that there was a vigorous debate on the phrase in Article VIII. "they ought thoroughly to be received." The idea of some was that the expression put these Creeds on too high a plane, endangering the authority of Scripture. "At last," he says, "it was resolved that that Article should be tendered to the Parliament, by way of humble advice, to be read thus: The Creeds that

go under the name of the Nice Creed, Athanasian Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, are thoroughly to be received and believed, for that the matter of them may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture" (*Journal*, p. 10). When the Articles were transmitted to Parliament the 8th Article was included, and in a form practically identical with that given by Lightfoot. Apparently, however, the objections to the inclusion of the Article had prevailed in Parliament.

33. The Assembly, as we have seen, revised only fifteen of the Thirty-nine Articles. Political and ecclesiastical events of great importance came in the way. The subsequent action of Assembly and Parliament in regard to the Articles may be stated at this point. On December 10th, 1646, the House of Commons sent down to the Assembly an order "to send up what is finished upon the Articles of the Church of England." A committee, appointed to consider the work done, reported on January 5th and 6th, 1647. Accordingly, "the old Articles and Scripture proofs of them," after being debated, were ordered to be sent up. On April 12th and 14th we have hints of discussions on a preface to these Articles, and on the 15th an order is given to write out the Articles and insert the Scripture proofs. A further order was received by the Assembly, requiring the Articles, and on April 26th, 1647, a committee was appointed to carry them up to Parliament: which was done on the 29th. The anxiety of Parliament is explained by the negotiations which were then going on between the King and the Houses. The Articles were part of the basis on which an arrangement was being made.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.

SECTIONS 34–42.

34. Influence of Scotland in the struggle between King and Parliament.
35. The English Parliament in difficulty.
36. Scottish desire for Uniformity: "Solemn League and Covenant."
37. "The Solemn League and Covenant" in England.
38. "The Solemn League and Covenant" adopted by Parliament and Assembly.
39. Was "the Solemn League and Covenant" a failure?
40. The Scottish Commissioners and their influence in the Assembly.
41. Baillie's Judgments on his fellow Commissioners: Maitland.
42. Baillie's Judgments (*continued*): Self-criticism.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.

34. We come now, in the Assembly's history, to an event of the greatest importance. It was an event which changed the whole current of the Assembly's procedure; but it had consequences, not for the Assembly only, but for the nation. It had political and ecclesiastical results of first-class importance. The event we refer to was the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant; and Robert Baillie has described it as "a new period and crise of the most great affaire, which these hundred yeares hes exercised thir dominions" (ii. 90). Up to this point the influence of Scotland had been more or less indirect, though her moral support had been undoubtedly great in the struggle for liberty in England. The event which we are now to describe brought the influence of Scotland directly to bear on the English struggle. It brought the Scottish army unequivocally into the military conflict; and it brought the Scottish Commissioners into the arena where doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions were being fought out. We shall now find these two influences, the influence of the Scottish army on the one hand, and the influence of the Scottish Commissioners on the other, *directly* at work in English life.

35. Since Edgehill, in October of the previous year (1642), things had somehow or other gone wrong with Parliament. In the north, Fairfax had been beaten. A

like fate had befallen Sir William Waller, and the south-west was the King's. Oxford was well fortified, and commanded the midland counties. The Queen had come with succours from the north. The heroic Hampden had lately been slain. It was truly a dark time; but Parliament, with Pym at its head, was equal to the emergency. Several decisive measures were at once adopted, the most important being the calling in of Scottish help. On Wednesday, August 2nd, as Lightfoot informs us in his *Journal*, "an order was brought in, whereby the Assembly was required to write a letter to the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to acknowledge their pious and good expressions towards the Church and State, and to desire them to stir up the people for their aid and assistance to this land." A committee was appointed to draw up this letter. On the 4th it was read, and, after some debate, passed. The Scottish General Assembly and the Convention of Estates were then sitting; and the intention was to send down this letter from the Westminster Assembly along with English Commissioners. This was accordingly done. The chief English Commissioners were Vane on the lay side, and Stephen Marshall and Philip Nye on the clerical. The Commissioners arrived in Edinburgh on the 7th of August.

36. The position SCOTLAND was in was difficult and delicate. On the one hand were her innate love of monarchy and the highly problematical result of the conflict Parliament was waging with the King. But on the other were the plain hints thrown out by Parliament concerning *Uniformity*—that dream of Scottish ecclesiastics! In the letter which the Commissioners had brought down from the Westminster Assembly, reference had been made to the zeal of Scotland in concurring "with the Parliament here, by all good and lawful means for

settling of Religion in godly unity and uniformity throughout all his Majesty's dominions." It was this consideration which carried the day; but many other considerations—high, moral considerations—swayed the General Assembly in coming to a decision. There is much in Baillie's remark which we must not blind ourselves to: "Surelie it was a great act of faith in God, and hudge courage and unheard of compassion that moved our nation to hazard their own peace and venture their lives, and all for to save a people so irrecoverablie ruined both in their owne and all the world's eyes" (ii. 99). At any rate, Scotland was decided on this point, that if the cause of England was to be espoused, one condition should be "uniformity in religion." In such a strong desire for uniformity Vane and Nye could not have been expected to concur. They accordingly tried to shift the question of religion on to the question of *civil union*. "The English," says Baillie, "were for a civil league; we, for a religious covenant." But the English Commissioners could not fail to be alive to the necessities of the case, and yielded. Henderson prepared a Covenant of such a nature as Scotland desired. When amended the treaty received the name of a "Solemn League and Covenant." Thus, the English Commissioners gained their point thus far, that under the term *league* was provided a way of escape in case their friends in England should require it. But there is not a shadow of doubt that the General Assembly in Scotland regarded the treaty in the light of the suggested and longed-for "uniformity in religion." This appears in many directions. For instance, it is evident from the zeal and enthusiasm, "the torrent of most affectionate expressions," with which the Covenant was received in the Scottish Assembly; and it is still more evident from Baillie's ingenuous confession, "The

chief aime of it (the Covenant) was for the propagation of our Church Discipline to England and Ireland; the great good and honour of our nation" (ii. 103).

37. The COMMISSIONERS appointed from Scotland were Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Robert Baillie, Samuel Rutherfurd, George Gillespie, the Earl of Cassilis, Lord Maitland, and Johnston of Warriston. Of these, Henderson, Gillespie, and Maitland set out for London immediately. The League had arrived there already; and when the Commissioners entered the Assembly, on the 15th of September, they found it under discussion. The Assembly had already approved of it and had sent it up to Parliament, where it had received a few slight alterations. These slight alterations were admitted by Baillie to be "for the better." The opposition in the Assembly had been extremely small. It had come chiefly from Episcopalians such as Daniel Featley, and from Dr. Cornelius Burgess, one of the assessors, whose opposition Lightfoot describes as "captiousness" and "intolerable impudency." Burgess was suspended, but restored after duly apologising. Featley was afterwards expelled. Though these were the chief objectors to the Covenant, there were some, such as the Prolocutor himself, who did not object on principle to "prelacy," and who would have been perfectly satisfied with a reformed and purified prelacy. The Solemn League and Covenant, as it came from Scotland, looked forward to the absolute extirpation of prelacy. The Assembly, accordingly, defined what it meant by "prelacy," and inserted this clause into the League, "prelacy (that is, Church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy)." The discussion over the

League was finished on September 15th, and "after all was done, Mr. Prolocutor, at the desire of the Assembly, gave thanks to God for the sweet concurrence of us in the Covenant" (Lightfoot, p. 15). A week after, the Assembly was informed that "the Lords and Commons intended to take the Covenant on Monday (25th September) in St. Margaret's, Westminster, and sent to us to do the like; and that we should appoint some to pray at the time and some to give a word of exhortation" (Lightfoot, p. 15).

38. The Covenant was taken by the House of Commons and the Assembly of Divines on September 25th, 1643. It was a solemn and significant ceremony. Lightfoot's account of it has the touch which only an absorbed eye-witness can give: "After a psalm given by Mr. *Wilson*, picking several verses, to suit the present occasion, out of several psalms, Mr. *White* prayed near upon an hour. Then he came down out of the pulpit, and Mr. *Nye* went up, and made an exhortation of another hour long. After he had done, Mr. *Henderson*, out of the seat where he sat, did the like; and all tended to forward the Covenant. Then Mr. *Nye*, being in the pulpit still, read the Covenant; and at every clause of it the House of Commons and we of the Assembly lift up our hands and gave our consent thereby to it, and then went all into the chancel and subscribed our hands; and afterward we had a prayer by Dr. *Gouge*, and another psalm by Mr. *Wilson*, and departed into the Assembly again; and after prayer, adjourned till Thursday morning, because of the fast" (p. 15). A full account of the memorable proceedings was published the same year in a small pamphlet of 34 pages (Lond. 1643). The addresses of Henderson and Philip Nye are most interesting. Nye's speech in particular, and his whole action in connection with the

"Solemn League and Covenant," have a peculiar interest. Whatever may be said about his after-conduct, it is difficult to detect anything but a true ring in the speech he made in St. Margaret's, Westminster. The Covenant was subscribed by two hundred and twenty-eight members of the House of Commons, and among the names are those of such prominent members as Pym, Rous, Vane (junior), John Goodwin, Selden, and Oliver Cromwell.

39. The questions which gather round the "Solemn League and Covenant" are not only interesting, but of great importance for a right appreciation of much of the subsequent history. Probably, however, historians will never be able to agree over the questions that arise in connection with it. It is admitted that many of those who signed the League and Covenant did not afterwards abide by it. Was there a misunderstanding on all sides? It may be charitable to think so. But it is certain that the Scottish people regarded the treaty as a distinct pledge that every effort would be made to secure uniformity on the basis of Presbyterianism. In the light of this clear understanding, it is not quite easy to see how a man such as Philip Nye could not merely have accepted the Covenant, but have advocated its adoption! Anyhow, the Scottish Commissioners felt that they had ground for their indignation at the after-conduct, not of Nye only, but of many who had signed the League and Covenant. But was the treaty a failure? Many have thought and said so. And, certainly, there is a sense in which it was a failure. The dream behind it, so dear to the Scottish heart—the dream of uniformity, one Presbyterian Church in a united country—that dream was not realised. The truth is that England did not take to Presbyterianism. But there are respects in which the "Solemn League and Covenant" was *not* a failure. Can that be

described as a failure which helped to secure civil and religious liberty in Britain? Can that be described as a failure which gave fresh life and impulse to Puritanism? And can that be described as a failure which helped to give us our Confession and our Catechisms? No. If the "Solemn League and Covenant" was in a sense a failure, it was at least a sublime failure. And nothing can detract from the heroic motives of the Scottish people when they imperilled the peace of their country to help England in the hour of her distress. "Surely, it was a great act of faith in God."[1]

40. We have already seen that the SCOTTISH COMMISSIONERS were Henderson, Douglas, Baillie, Rutherfurd, and Gillespie, with the Earl of Cassilis, Lord Maitland, and Johnston of Warriston. Neither Douglas nor the Earl of Cassilis ever sat in the Assembly. Other lay Commissioners visited the Westminster Assembly now and then, such as Argyll himself; but the four divines were the really constant representatives from Scotland. Henderson and Gillespie came up to the Assembly on the 15th of September 1643; Baillie and Rutherfurd on the 20th of November. They were all greatly esteemed and well looked after in London. A special house to lodge in and a special church to preach in were no small privileges. Numerically, they were few; but it is un-

[1] The "Solemn League and Covenant" is a fruitful subject of discussion in all histories of this period, and very various views are taken of it. The views of contemporaries who could not accept it may be found extensively in the pamphlet literature of the time, as, for instance, in "Anti-confederacy, or a discovery of the iniquity and hypocrisie of the Solemne League and Covenant," 1644; or in "Reasons of the present judgment of the University of Oxford, concerning the Solemne League and Covenant," 1647, which will also be found conveniently as an appendix to the *Life of Dr. Robert Sanderson* in Walton's *Lives*.

necessary to say that several things combined to make their influence very great. They were men of eminent ability, and on that account alone would have certainly carried weight. But, in addition, there were the circumstances which brought them to London; above all, a nation was at their back. In no sense were they ordinary members of Assembly. Baillie tells us that, when the Scottish Commissioners first arrived, they were desired to sit as members of the Assembly. This they would not hear of. They were Commissioners, they said, from their National Church to treat for *Uniformity*, and they required to be dealt with in that capacity. They also claimed the right of sitting, in their representative capacity, on all committees,—a right granted to them. They were men whose minds were settled, who had mastered the details of a system that was in full and flourishing operation; and they had all the influence arising from superior knowledge and opportunities. Still it would be unfair to say that they were unreasonable in their advocacy of their own Church system, and that on their unreasonableness uniformity was wrecked. The Scottish Commissioners were not fanatics. Their leader, Alexander Henderson, had one of the broadest and most comprehensive minds among Scottish Church statesmen; and it may be fairly asserted that, if there had been a clear feeling and a brotherly desire in favour of some modification or compromise, the obstacle would not have been found among the Scottish Commissioners.

41. The Scots were to add greatly to the debating power of the Assembly. Henderson did not speak inordinately; but in every point he was consulted, and his leadership was acknowledged. Rutherfurd and Gillespie were princes in debate. Baillie spoke little, and has left

it on record, "The longer I live, bold and pert loquacitie I love it the worse" (ii. 85). In one respect he was the Nye of the Scottish Commissioners: he had an undue fondness for little matters of diplomacy—schemes, it has been pointed out, which were peculiarly transparent. The Scottish Commissioners were a loving and harmonious party, linked together by country, persuasion, and piety. At any rate, Robert Baillie has left some testimonies to his colleagues which quite do justice to them, and show at the same time the qualities of his own heart. Nothing could show the frailty of human judgment better than some of Baillie's testimonies to Maitland. "I profess," he says, "the very great sufficiencie and happiness of good Maitland,—a youth that brings, by his noble carriage, credit to our nation and help to our cause." Then he goes on to remark that "the best here (London) makes very much of him" (*Letters*, ii. 106, 107). Later on, in 1645, during the Independent troubles, Baillie testifies that there is "no living man fitter to doe Scotland service against the plotting Independents, which for the time hes a great hand in the State" (ii. 296). For how could good Baillie have foreseen, in the enthusiastic and Presbyterian Maitland, the persecuting and hated Lauderdale, associate of James Sharp? Baillie's affection for Maitland remained strong, even though latterly it received many severe shocks. His later correspondence presents many a pleading with Lauderdale, many a bitter cry or sad reminder of past days; and nothing could be more pathetic than an expression in a letter to Sharp, two years before his own death: "Tell my Lord Lauderdale that I am the old man towards him" (iii. 401).

42. It was Gillespie, however, who received the largest share of Baillie's praise. When the question of elders

was under discussion, Baillie writes: "None in all the companie did reason more, and more pertinentlie, than Mr. Gillespie. That is ane excellent youth; my heart blesses God in his behalfe: for Mr. Henderson and Mr. Rutherfurd, all the world knows their graces" (ii. 117). Or again, "Verie learned and acute Mr. Gillespie, a singular ornament of our Church" (ii. 129); "that noble youth, Mr. Gillespie: I trulie admire his facultie (of debate), and blesses God, as for all my colleagues, so for him in that facultie with the first of the whole Assemblie" (ii. p. 140). In a letter to Blair, dated March 26th, 1644, Baillie's heart runs over: Rutherfurd is his "sweet colleague, Samuell"; Henderson, "such a jewell"; of Gillespie, "not one speaks more rationallie and to the point than that brave youth hes ever done"; and of all his colleagues he says, "Thanks to God, never colleagues had a greater harmonie; for to this hour not the least difference, not the smallest cyclist betwixt any of us . . . makes our fellowship much the sweeter." Of himself, Baillie is candid enough to say, "I find that my studies in these questions have been so small, and my parts so weake, that I have not taken the boldnesse to dispute publiklie in the Assemblie." He adds characteristically, "After the example of a great many, farr in all things my betters, even the two or three parts, or more, of the Assemblie, I have been but ane hearer" (ii. 159, 160). Now and then, however, in committee God would open his mouth, to use his own expressive phrase, as, for instance, on one occasion when he spoke "somewhat to his own contentment." It so happened that the Directory for Public Worship was under discussion before a sub-committee in the end of 1643, and Goodwin had "assayed to turn all upside downe, to reason against all directories." Despite Baillie's "good, new, extemporall

answers," Goodwin would not be satisfied; so adds Baillie, "For the help of this evile, we thought it best to speak with him in private; so we invited him to dinner, and spent an afternoon with him verie sweetlie" (*Letters*, ii. 123).

CHAPTER V.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SECTIONS 43–52.

43. Changes in Programme of Assembly's work.
44. Beginnings of the *Church Government* debate.
45. The Question of Church Officers.
46. Church Officers: Pastors and Teachers.
47. Church Officers: Ruling Elders.
48. Are there Ruling Elders *jure divino?*
49. Tide of "Independency" meantime rising.
50. Questions affecting Ordination.
51. What was to be done in the emergency?
52. "First-fruits of the Assembly"—Directory for Ordination.

CHAPTER V.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

43. When the Assembly and Parliament adopted the "Solemn League and Covenant," a change became inevitable in the Assembly's programme. The first Article of the Covenant must be quoted, as it enables us to understand the wider issues now set before the Westminster Assembly: "That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the Reformed Religion in the Church of *Scotland*, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland*, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, according to the word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches; and shall endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church Government, Directory for Worship, and Catechising; that we, and our Posterity after us, may, as Brethren, live in Faith and Love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us." It was to be expected, therefore, that the work before the Assembly should be somewhat modified. This was done on the 12th of October (1643). We may quote Lightfoot's words: "We being at that instant very busy upon the 16th Article of the Thirty-nine Articles of

the Church of England, . . . there came an order to us from both Houses of Parliament . . . to confer and treat among themselves of such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other reformed Churches abroad, to be settled in this Church in stead and place of the present Church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending on the hierarchy, which is resolved to be taken away" (Lightfoot, *Journal*, p. 17). The order also provided for the settling of "a directory of worship, or liturgy."

44. To discipline themselves to Christian patience, and to implore God's guidance and blessing in their work, the Assembly kept a solemn fast on Monday, 16th October. Whitaker and Palmer preached, while Burgess, Goodwin, Stanton, and the Prolocutor engaged in prayer. On the following day, the Assembly threw itself into the discussion of CHURCH GOVERNMENT. The first question discussed related to *the method of procedure.* The Independents, evidently, were in favour of beginning with the question, whether *any* rule of Church government was revealed in Scripture. Their motion, however, was not carried, and the Assembly set itself to deliberate on CHURCH OFFICERS. As to these, the Presbyterians and the Independents were, at this period, happily at one. The debates which ensued in the Assembly were elaborate and prolonged; and, though it is not possible, or indeed desirable, to enter into them with any detail, something may be noted about them, if only as an illustration of the Assembly's method of work. The committees had been given their work on October 17th, and

on the 19th the second and third committees gave in their reports. The *second committee's* report was as follows: "In inquiring after the officers belonging to the Church of the New Testament, we first find that Christ, who is Priest, Prophet, King, and Head of the Church, hath fulness of power, and containeth all other offices by way of eminency in Himself; and therefore hath many of their names attributed to Him." Then passages were adduced to prove that "Christ is Priest, Prophet, King, Head; hath fulness of Power; containeth all offices; beareth in Scripture the following names of Church Officers, Apostle, Pastor, Bishop, Teacher, Minister."

45. The report of the third committee was also handed in. "They stated," says Lightfoot, "these four questions: (1) What officers are mentioned in the New Testament? (2) What officers of these were *pro tempore*, and what durable? (3) What names common to divers offices, and what restrained? (4) What the office of those standing officers?" This committee also prepared a draft of the sublime preface: "Jesus Christ, upon whose shoulders the government is, whose name is called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, of the increase of whose government and peace there shall be no end . . . He being ascended far above all heavens, and filling all things . . . hath given all officers necessary for the edification of His Church, which are named in these, and other places, some whereof are extraordinary and some ordinary: 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 8, v. 17, etc." "Out of these Scriptures they found these officers: apostles, evangelists, prophets, pastors, teachers, bishops or overseers, presbyters or elders, deacons, widows" (*Journal*, pp. 22, 23). With some exceptions, these two reports were quickly discussed

and passed. On Friday, October 27th, the chairman of the first committee gave in a report dealing with the Pastor and his duties. On the same day, an interesting discussion arose on a proposition of Seaman's, "that the Apostles had the keys immediately given to them." This proposition was debated for four days with zeal and learning. The distinctive principles of Erastianism came out in the argument of Lightfoot and others, that by "the power of the keys" was meant nothing more than the power to preach or teach or declare doctrine. The Independents, on the other hand, argued that the powers of the keys were given to the Church, or to the Apostles and the Church; "but it would not be hearkened to." The result of the discussion was "that the Apostles did use and exercise the authoritative power of the keys."

46. Discussions followed about the place and the duties of *Pastors* and *Teachers* or *Doctors*. These discussions were very intricate, and lasted from the 2nd to the 21st of November. Some held that Pastors and Teachers were one and the same in substance; others, that the Doctor or Teacher "was not an ordinary and perpetual office, the same exactly with a Pastor." The Independents were anxious to retain the two officers in the Church, for which the Scottish Commissioners were not unwilling: the English divines, on the other hand, rejected the idea that under these names are two distinct offices. Henderson exercised a great influence in this debate; it was upon his "motion for accommodation" that resolutions were ultimately passed. Robert Baillie came up to the Assembly in the course of this debate—"a verie sharp debaite," he calls it. He tells us that the Independents were "for the divine institution of a Doctor in every congregation, as well as a Pastor." Others were convinced of the "simple identity of Pastors and Doctors." In the

end the Assembly agreed on certain propositions, deprecating the absolute necessity of a Doctor in every congregation, or the divine institution of his office; "yet where two ministers can be had in one congregation, the one is allowed according to his gift to apply himself most to teaching, and the other to exhortation, according to the Scripture" (*Letters*, ii. 110). This matter was decided on November 21st.

47. On the following day, two important matters came forward. The first was an order from the House of Commons, requesting the Assembly's advice on the advisability of using Rous's Metrical Version of the Psalms in churches. This important subject was referred to the three committees, each of which took fifty psalms. Their report will be considered afterwards. The second matter was the difficult and much debated subject of Ruling Elders. The debate was based on a report of the second committee (November 8th): "That besides those presbyters which rule well and labour in the word and doctrine, there be other presbyters who especially apply themselves to ruling, though they do not labour in the word and doctrine; 1 Tim. v. 17; Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 8" (Lightfoot, *Journal*, p. 43). This report was debated from November 22nd to December 8th. The debate was opened by a speech from Henderson, recommending ruling elders because they had been a long time in the Reformed Church, and had proved a useful office. He spoke for Scotland with confidence. There "it had been very prosperous to the Church." The members of Assembly then threw themselves with ardour on the passages of Scripture which the committee had adduced as proofs. It is not necessary to enter on the elaborate debates over these passages of Scripture. There was very considerable opposition in the

Assembly to the scriptural institution of Ruling Elders. There was perfect unanimity in admitting the authority of Ruling Elders "in a prudential way"; but there was great reluctance on the part of many, such as Herle or Palmer, to admit the warrant for an institution which they argued was not expressly appointed by Christ, the Head of the Church. The result was a compromise, in which the hand of Henderson is apparent. It was, for the time at least, agreed that there was in Scripture warrant for the office of Ruling Elder, but that there was not evidence of its institution as an office of "perpetual and universal obligation." The finding of the Assembly was that "it is agreeable and warranted by the word of God that *some others* beside the ministers of the word or Church governors should join with the ministers in the government of the Church." Baillie, who was deeply interested in this question, has given us some glimpses of the debate. "Manie a verie brave dispute," he says, "have we had upon them (*i.e.* Ruling Elders) during these ten dayes." "There was no doubt," he adds, "but we would have carried it by far most voices." "We have been," he says on December 7th, "in a pitifull labyrinth these twelve dayes about Ruling Elders; we yet stick into it." "We have after verie manie dayes debaite agreed that, beside ministers of the word, there is other ecclesiastick governours to joyn with the ministers of the word in the government of the Church; that such are agreeable unto and warranted by the word of God, especiallie the 12th Rom. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28" (*Letters*, ii. 110, 111, 116).

48. It is clear, then, that at this point the Assembly neither accepted nor rejected the distinct and divine institution of the Ruling Eldership, along with its *universal* obligation. The language adopted simply meant that there was scriptural warrant for the office. It is

clear, however, that the majority of the members were prepared to go further than that, and hold that the office is of divine right or institution (*jure divino*), is perpetual, and obligatory. This appears, among other indications, from the fact that on June 21st, 1648, the Assembly, when answering the nine *Jus Divinum* Queries of Parliament, accepted the following proposition: "The government which is *jure divino* is that which is by *preaching* and *ruling* elders, in presbyteries and synods, by way of subordination and appeal" (*Minutes of Assembly*, p. 525). It may, however, be argued that the original finding of the Assembly is the preferable one. The high or *jus divinum* theory just noted, so elaborately expounded by Gillespie, does not fall in with the trend of modern investigations. In accordance with these, we may prefer to conclude that in the New Testament elders do not fall into two distinct classes of *teaching* elders and *ruling* elders. The presbyters originally both taught and ruled; but, in course of time, gifts manifested themselves in one direction or in another. The special gift found an expression in the special *class*, and the exigencies of the Christian society rendered the distinction of class or office expedient.[1]

49. We are now at the end of the year 1643. The Assembly so far had been working harmoniously. A spirit of conciliation was abroad; and by no one was this spirit fostered more than by Alexander Henderson, whose wise and cautious leadership had impressed itself deeply on the Assembly. Many delicate points about

[1] Reference may be made to the discussions on "Early Church Organisation" of Lightfoot, Hatch, Harnack, Gwatkin (Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*), etc. The most luminous treatment of the questions connected with the organisation and ministry of the New Testament Church is in Professor Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* (1902).

Church officers had been carefully discussed and adjusted. But in 1644 a change began to creep over the Assembly. The tide of INDEPENDENCY was rising. We can see from indications in Baillie's *Letters* that the Presbyterians in the Assembly were becoming anxious, and that the fear was growing lest the rise of Independency and sectarianism outside the Assembly, more particularly in the army, should ruin their dream of Uniformity. "This," says Baillie, writing about the debate on Ruling Elders, "is a point of high consequence; and upon no other we expect so great difficultie, except alone on Independencie; wherewith we purpose not to medle in haste, till it please God to advance our armie, *which we expect will much assist our arguments*" (ii. 111). In a later letter to a correspondent in Scotland he says: "In the time of this anarchie, the divisions of people weeklie does much encrease: the Independent partie growes; but the Anabaptists more; and the Antinomians most. . . . It was my advyce, which Mr. Hendersone presentlie applauded, and gave me thanks for it, to eschew a public rupture with the Independents till we were more able for them. As yet a Presbyterie to this people is conceaved to be a strange monster" (ii. 117). However, "the question of Presbytery" could not be delayed much longer, and when the debate did begin, it proved to be what Baillie calls a long "tig-tagging."

50. The debate was delayed by the consideration of certain questions affecting ORDINATION. These questions were of great importance in view of the increase in *Antinomianism*. Something had also to be done in view of "the scandalous condition of the priesthood." This scandalous condition is described in a booklet, ordered to be printed 17th November 1643, and entitled *The First Century of Scandalous and Malignant Priests.*

The details given there are very terrible, though one has a feeling that probably the picture is overdrawn. One example, which has its amusing side, may be quoted: "When young people and servants have come to him to pay their offerings and be examined of their fitness to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, his manner always was to ask them how many pigs their fathers and mothers had, and how many fowl they kept, and how many lambs; and, when they had fully informed him thereof, admitted them to the Sacrament without any further examination"! (p. 48). If right and proper ministers were to be ordained in a right and proper manner, something had to be done in the matter of Ordination. Accordingly, on January 9th, 1644, a report about Ordination was given in by Temple from the third committee. The report first defined Ordination as "the solemn setting apart of a person to some public office in the Church"; and then stated that in Scripture, "Apostles, Evangelists, and Preaching Presbyters did ordain." An addition to the report was made on the 11th of January,—a most debatable addition,—namely, "We humbly conceive that the preaching presbyters are *only* to ordain." It was over this addition that most controversy arose. The Independents were strongly opposed to this addition, and, as Baillie puts it, "debated all things too prolixlie which came within twenty miles of their quarters" (ii. 129).

51. The debate over "Preaching Presbyters" and Ordination had to be postponed for a little in consequence of an order from the House of Lords to do something at once "for the present emergency." So the Assembly appointed a committee, which reported that, in extraordinary cases, something extraordinary could be done until there was a settled Order of Church Government,

and, further, that it was lawful and according to the word of God that certain ministers in the city should be desired to ordain ministers in the vicinity. The debate over this report was extraordinarily keen. The Independents, headed by Philip Nye, contended that there was nothing extraordinary in the present emergency; and even if there were, "one minister singly and alone might ordain"; "the Church had in itself the power of ordination." In the debate Nye allied himself with the Erastians, who contended that the bishops might be allowed to ordain, inasmuch as the Covenant which they had adopted had rejected, not the Church's power of ordination, but simply the "jurisdiction of the Church." Selden, in thus arguing, aroused the indignation of the Scottish Commissioners, particularly of Henderson, who greatly resented his references to the Covenant. When it came to the question whether the preaching presbyters of London might ordain, the debate became exceedingly animated. The Independents would not listen to the proposition, because they said it meant really setting up a Presbytery. Many urged haste, but "Mr. Nye still and still stopped us" (Lightfoot, p. 129). It was ultimately agreed to postpone the discussion. The debate about Ordination was resumed on the 18th of March and finished on the 22nd, after what Lightfoot calls "a great deal of time and tug."

52. On the 3rd of April a committee handed in the Twelve Propositions about Ordination, which embody the doctrinal part. On the 19th of April a draft of the Directory for Ordination (*i.e.* the practical part) was submitted to the Assembly, and, after some discussion, adopted. Next day the whole was presented to both Houses of Parliament "as the first-fruits of the Assembly." Parliament was in no great hurry to ratify the Assembly's

work on Ordination, as can be understood from the influence of Independency in Parliament. When the matter of Ordination was again brought before the Assembly (August 15th), it was found that Parliament had omitted the doctrinal part altogether, had struck out of the practical part or Directory all reference to a Presbytery, and had even attached a preface of their own. "They had scraped out," says Baillie, "whatever might displease the Independents, or patrons, or Selden and others *who will have no discipline at all in any Church*, jure divino, *but settled only upon the freewill and pleasure of the Parliament*" (ii. 198). Henderson was particularly displeased with Parliament's preface; and, in point of fact, this preface has never had a place among the Assembly's productions, although it was persistently retained in the Ordinance of Parliament. In editions of the Confession of Faith, etc., the work of the Assembly on "Ordination" appears along with the "Form of Presbyterial Church Government." In the Scotch edition of 1647 the two works appear with the title "Propositions concerning Church Government and Ordination of Ministers." They were approved of by the General Assembly in Edinburgh, February 10th, 1645, "as the results of the long and learned debates of the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster."

CHAPTER VI.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT (*continued*).

SECTIONS 53–61.

53. Debate on "Presbytery."
54. Views of Scottish Commissioners about Presbyterianism.
55. The *Apologetical Narration*, or Manifesto of the Independents.
56. Extracts from the *Apologetical Narration*.
57. Replies to it: Edwards' *Antapologia*.
58. Arguments of Independents against "Presbytery."
59. Goodwin's and Bridge's arguments.
60. John Selden on Matthew xviii. 17.
61. Gillespie's reply, and Philip Nye's speech on February 21st, 1644.

CHAPTER VI

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT (*continued*).

53. We have now to describe the debate over that question of Presbytery on which so much depended. We have already seen how anxious the members were about the result of this debate. Baillie and his fellow Commissioners from Scotland saw quite clearly that, if they could not carry the Assembly with them, the dearly-cherished hope of uniformity in religion would not be realised. On the 19th of January 1644, Burgess, as convener of the first committee, reported concerning the *Presbytery* as follows: "(1) The Scripture holdeth out a Presbytery in a Church, 1 Tim. iv. 14; Acts xv. 2, 4, 6; (2) a Presbytery consisteth of ministers of the word, and such other public officers as have been already voted to have a share in the government in the Church" (Lightfoot, *Journal*, p. 115). On the same day, Stanton gave in a report about Church censures, which will meet us afterwards. Before the propositions about the Presbytery could be discussed, the Assembly, as we have seen, had to consider, in view of the necessities of the moment, the question of Ordination. But early in February the debate was fully under weigh. On Tuesday, February 6th, the point before the Assembly was this: "*The Scripture holdeth forth, that many particular congregations may be under one Presbyterial Government.*" The

debate over this proposition was one of the most important the Assembly ever had.

54. The debate was considerably influenced by certain publications which appeared at the time. Perhaps these ought to be noticed at this point. The Scottish Commissioners, who really knew most about Presbyterianism, were also most anxious that the Scottish Church government should be adopted in England. They determined to give the Assembly the fullest information. On November 14th, 1643, Marshall brought in "a report from the Committee of the Scots, and of the Houses, and of the Assembly, importing the desire of the Scots' Commissioners, which they had imparted to that Committee" (Lightfoot, *Journal*, p. 50). This report stated the officers in the Scottish Church, the method of government, but especially "that there were four sorts of Assemblies among them, Church sessions or particular elderships, classes of Presbyters, provincial Synods, national Assemblies." Again, on January 24th, just after the subject of the Presbytery had been introduced by Burgess, the Scottish Commissioners presented each member of the Assembly with a book "touching their own government." Next day Marshall again reported from the Grand Committee of Lords, Commons, and Divines, "something more concerning their government," which the Scottish Commissioners had submitted in the form of a paper. The paper was a statement of the fourfold character of their Assemblies, with reasons and scriptural proofs. Marshall moved that this paper should be recommended to the committee which had under consideration the question of a Presbytery; but it shows the feeling which was growing in the Assembly that this motion was strongly opposed by the Independents and Selden. In all this action of the Scottish Commissioners

there was nothing unconstitutional or ungracious. Indeed, the Assembly was very grateful for the information.

55. The Independents also issued a pamphlet: it was their famous Apologetical Narration. This pamphlet, unfortunately, was not issued for the information and guidance of the Assembly only; it was their manifesto to the Assembly, to Parliament, and to the people. It was about the beginning of January 1644 that the little work was published.[1] Baillie tells us that a copy of the work was presented to each member of the Assembly. "That same day," he adds, "they invited us and some principal men of the Assemblie to a verie great feast, when we had not read their book. So no word of that matter was betwixt us." The *Apologetical Narration* was an authoritative exposition of the views of the Independents on Church government, and so far the Independents had a perfect right to embody their opinions in a work for the guidance and information of the Assembly. But it is clear that the Independents meant more than this. They meant the work not for the Assembly only, but for a much wider audience. They meant to enlist on their side Parliament and the people. The impression their work gave to those outside the Assembly was that the Presbyterians were *intolerant*, and that the Independents had, in consequence, to appeal to an outside force. This impression was entirely erroneous. No Assembly, guided on questions of Church government by such wise and moderate statesmanship as that of Henderson, could have been absolutely intolerant. Up to this point there had been a very real desire to reach some common platform. The publication of the *Apologetical Narration*, and its appeal to a force outside

[1] It is registered at "Stationers' Hall, December 30th, 1643." Cf. Masson's *Milton*, iii. 23.

the Assembly, aroused the keenest resentment; and the feeling was intensified by the bitter strictures to which the Independents had laid themselves open, as in Edwards' *Antapologia*. The Presbyterians in the Assembly regarded the publication and circulation of the *Apologetical Narration* as a distinct slight and breach of confidence. In Parliament, however, the publication of the work aroused sympathy for Independency; and among the outside public it made the Independents the champions of *sectarianism*.

56. The pamphlet extends to only thirty-one pages. Its title is: *An Apologetical Narration, humbly submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament.* By Tho. Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jer. Burroughes, and William Bridge. London, . . . 1643. A few extracts may be given in illustration. They have been obliged, the authors say, by "unexpected noise of confused explanations," to anticipate "that discovery of themselves which otherwise they had resolved to leave to time and experience of their ways and spirits." So they address themselves to Parliament, "the most sacred refuge and asylum for mistaken and misjudged innocence" (pp. 1, 2). They then proceed to give an account of themselves in England, and, when in exile, how they were tolerated and did tolerate (pp. 6 ff.). After giving a statement of their principles, they say, "Not claiming to ourselves an independent power in every congregation to give account or be subject to none other, but only a full and entire power complete within ourselves, until we should be challenged to err grossly" (p. 14). They disclaim the name *Independency*, "that proud and insolent title of Independency" (p. 23). "We did then and do here publicly profess we believe the truth to lie and consist in a middle way, betwixt that which is falsely

charged on us, *Brownism*, and that which is the contention of these times, the authoritative Presbyterial Government, in all the subordinations and proceedings of it" (p. 24). They cherish "a hopeful expectation of a happy latitude." Their prayer is for "the allowance of a latitude to some lesser differences" (p. 31). In doctrine, as apart from Church government, they are completely in agreement with Presbyterians.

57. In a pamphlet-loving age, the *Apologetical Narration* could not escape without extensive notice. The controversy to which it gave rise outside the Assembly greatly embittered feeling within it. Pamphlets against the *Apologetical Narration* were written by A. S. (Adam Stewart), and answered by the Independents. From abroad came a letter of condemnation "from the classis (Presbytery) of Walcheren." It was, says Baillie, "a long and sharpe censure of the *Apologetick Narration* (ii. 143). The longest reply came from the caustic pen of Thomas Edwards. Baillie calls it "a splendid confutation"; which may be gravely doubted. It was published in a small quarto of 307 pages, in the end of July 1644. Edwards called his work *Antapologia*. "My scope," he says, "in this answer is the endeavouring to undeceive the people, and to wipe off the paint, and to show the snake under the green grass, and the foul hand under the white glove!" (p. 3). So Edwards takes up the statements of the Independents one by one, examines them, and endeavours to prove them false. The Independents, he says, were not retiring or inactive; they were not badly off in Holland; they had not prospered in their discipline there; they had not kept aloof from Brownists and sectaries; and so on. In his *Antapologia*, Edwards shows us anti-toleration in its sharpest and boldest form. Not even a

limited *toleration* is allowed to the Independents. "I humbly beseech the Parliament seriously to consider the depths of Satan in this design of a Toleration. . . . 'Tis his masterpiece for England" (pp. 303 f.). Happily, all Presbyterians, even in his own day, were not so unreasonable and intolerant as Thomas Edwards.

58. Undoubtedly, the pamphlet war we have just referred to, and the bitter controversy associated with it outside the Assembly, did much to create feeling in the Assembly itself, and to wreck all efforts to secure a platform of government in which all might agree. When there was so much feeling outside the Assembly, it was inconceivable that there should be unanimity within it. This became apparent in the debate over the question of PRESBYTERY. We have seen (par. 53) that Burgess submitted a report from the committee on January 19th, 1644. On the 6th of February the point under debate was this: "The Scripture holdeth forth that many particular congregations may be under one Presbyterial Government." The debate had begun the day before, as we find from Gillespie's valuable notes, which date from this point. Gillespie gives us Goodwin's first argument at considerable length, but the pith of it is well put by Lightfoot: "If many elders put together make one Presbytery classical, then every one of those elders is to be reputed as an elder to every one of those Churches." (*Journal*, p. 132). He added: "The word of God doth not warrant any such thing." The debate which followed was scholastic and subtle. Vines, Marshall, Gillespie, Seaman, and others replied at considerable length to Goodwin. The common sense of the argument was very effectively put by Gillespie, whose words may be quoted: "It follows not because many regiments are under one martial government, the commanders of the regiments

being joined in one council for managing the war, therefore each in that council bears the relation of a commander to each regiment. Because the United Provinces are under one Government of the States-General, therefore each commissioner among the States-General bears a relation to each province; so here the Parliament governs all the countries, but each knight or burgess bears not relation to each country or city. I deny it, the rather because it strikes also against synods; if a national synod govern all the Churches in a nation, then each one in the synod is a governor of each congregation in the nation. The first simile fits our case best, because these that make up the great council of war do also govern their own regiments apart" (p. 11). It was a remarkable debate, and Lightfoot tells us incidentally that "so many of both Houses crowded in that we wanted room."

59. It is not necessary to give in detail the arguments which the Independents brought forward in this memorable debate. The arguments have been carefully classified by Gillespie. For instance, the question of Church censures arose, and Goodwin argued from the inter-connection of congregations in Presbyteries, that all the congregations would have to be present at Church censures! By the 15th of February, it was concluded that the arguments brought forward did not invalidate the Presbyterian position. On the 15th, however, Goodwin brought forward another argument: "Obedience and government relate to each other; but the highest obedience to the guides of the Church, as it is found in Scripture, cannot *competere* to a classis ('cannot belong to a Presbytery of many Churches,' Lightfoot); therefore, there can be no such government. He instanced Heb. xiii. 7, 17; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; 1 Tim. v. 17" (Gillespie, p. 20). The argument, according to Light-

foot, was judged very weak, "and yet it held us a long tug, and very many *pro* and *contras* passed, and the Independents did still remonstrate" (p. 159). The Assembly was on the point of agreeing to pass to the affirmative side of the debate, when Bridge mentioned that he had an argument out of Matt. xviii. 17: "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." In arguing from this text, Bridge went on the assumption that by "Church" (*ecclesia*) a particular congregation was meant, and he contended that "every particular congregation consisting of elders and brethren should have entire and full power of jurisdiction within themselves." He endeavoured to prove that *ecclesia* did not mean a civil court, or the Jewish Church, or the universal Church; above all, it did not mean a Presbytery; for though the word occurred some forty-eight times in the New Testament, it never once meant a Presbytery.

60. Satisfactory replies were given to Bridge's argument by Marshall, and more particularly by Vines, who pointed out that at the time the words were spoken there were really no congregations in the Christian sense, and the name *ecclesia* referred chiefly to the *officers*. But the interest of the debate does not lie so much in the argument between the Independents and the Presbyterians, as in the introduction of an *Erastian* element in the course of the discussion. On February 20th, Selden made a remarkable speech. Referring to Matt. xviii. 17, the passage under debate, he contended that there was no ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the passage at all! He argued that Matthew's Gospel was the first written; that it was written in Hebrew, and translated into Greek by John; that the early date of the book makes us explain

the word by Jewish usages of the time; that the expression might very well mean a Sanhedrim, more especially as Christ was at the time in Capernaum, where there was a Sanhedrim; that, in short, "tell it to the Church" simply meant this, "If an Israelite offend thee, tell it to the Sanhedrim" (cf. Lightfoot, p. 166; Gillespie, p. 25). The honour of replying to Selden fell to Herle, the future Prolocutor of the Assembly. He pointed out, in an argument which appealed to the Assembly, that if John translated this Gospel, he was a translator who certainly had the Spirit. He closed his reply by pointing out that the "tell it to the Church" (*dic ecclesiæ*) "coheres in this chapter with spiritual duties and scandals." Marshall also replied to Selden; but Lightfoot confesses that the reply gave him no satisfaction.

61. Next day, February 21st, saw the end of the debate. On this day Gillespie made his memorable speech in reply to Selden. Selden had contended that the *ecclesia* of Matt. xviii. 17 was a civil court. In no fewer than seven arguments, Gillespie replied to him, showing that the court must have been *ecclesiastical*. All the associations, he said, were of a spiritual nature: the nature of the offence, the end in view, the persons, the manner of proceeding, the censure, etc. It was a great and conclusive reply. Though the germ of it may be found in Herle's unprepared reply of the day before, yet one cannot sufficiently admire the ability and the lucidity of Gillespie's argument. Gillespie's was not the only memorable speech of that memorable day. Erastians and Independents had been alike worsted in debate. The Jerusalem Chamber was crowded with members of Parliament. The opportunity was one which Philip Nye could not let slip. If he could not worst the Presbyterians in debate, he might at least prejudice their case.

"It is inconvenient," he reasoned, "to nourish such a vast body in a commonwealth. . . . Look abroad, and nothing troubles men more than to think whether the Presbytery shall be set up *jure divino*. That if it be, it will grow as big as the civil." As he went on to quote Rutherfurd, all patience was lost, and "there was a great heat." Even Henderson, with all his cautiousness, was roused to anger, and cried out "that he spake like Sanballat, Tobiah, or Symmachus." Marshall poured forth his eloquence, and proved to the members of Parliament that there should be no such fear of Presbytery. Warriston showed, with a lawyer's acumen, that the ecclesiastical and civil governments strengthen each other; and Whitelocke, "the Parliament man," concluded with, "what a confusion it will prove to have congregations independent." Baillie, in reporting the scene, remarks: "We were all highlie offended with him. The Assemblie voted him to have spoken against order; this is the highest of their censures" (ii. 146). Commenting on "that miscarriage of Nye," he further adds: "Ever since, we find him, in all things, the most accommodating man in the company." After this outburst of passion, the Assembly passed to consider the Presbyterian argument. The Independents had exhausted their objections. "The most they had to say against the Presbyterie," says Baillie, "was but curious idle niceties." In another place he describes their arguments as "velitations of quiddities."

CHAPTER VII.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT (*continued*): *TOLERATION.*

SECTIONS 62–68.

62. The scriptural argument for Presbyterianism.
63. Three propositions on Presbyterianism.
64. A Fast-day in the Assembly.
65. "Form of Church Government" sent up to Parliament.
66. Cromwell and the Independents.
67. Independents' reasons of dissent.
68. The question of Toleration.

CHAPTER VII.

QUESTIONS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT (*continued*): TOLERATION.

62. Though the Independents had shown very clearly where they stood, the debate between the Presbyterians and them was by no means over. It continued, indeed, so long as the questions of Church government were under discussion, though it never reached the height or created the intense feeling of the debate arising out of their argument from Matt. xviii. 17. As we have seen, when this debate was finished, the Assembly turned to discuss the scriptural argument for Presbyterianism. The first argument was based on the example of the *Church of Jerusalem*. This debate began on February 22nd. There was a time during it when the Independents and the Presbyterians came very near each other. On March 8th, Nye made a remarkable admission, that "the keys of doctrine are in the hands of a Synod or Assembly." The remark was at once caught up, Vines pointing out how near the Independents had come to the Presbyterian position, and expressing the hope that "some accommodation" might be secured (Lightfoot, p. 205). Accordingly, a committee was appointed, evidently on urgent pressure from Henderson. The committee consisted of Seaman, Vines, Palmer, Goodwin, Bridge, Burroughes, Marshall, Nye, and the Scottish Commissioners. The committee met while the debate was in

progress, and though it gave in reports of propositions now and then (as on March 14th and 21st), very little came of it. Baillie apparently was hopeful that some good result would follow. "We have mett," he says, "some three or four times alreadie, and have agreed on five or six propositions, hopeing by God's grace to agree in more." He is specially pleased that the Independents have yielded "that a Presbyterie, even as we take it, is ane ordinance of God" (ii. 147).

63. The debate over the positive arguments for Presbyterianism was now in progress. For a short time it was interrupted by discussions on Ordination (see §§ 50–52); but by the middle of April it was proceeding energetically. A committee, consisting of the Prolocutor, assessors, and clerks, gave in a report, tabulating the results which the Assembly had already secured. From this report it appeared that the Assembly had already voted three propositions, namely, (1) "The Scripture doth hold out a Presbytery in a Church; 1 Tim. iv. 14; Acts xv. 2, 4, 6. (2) A Presbytery consisteth of ministers of the Word, and such other public officers as are agreeable to and warranted by the Word of God to be Church governors, to join with the ministers in the government of the Church; Rom. xii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28. (3) The Scripture holds forth that many congregations may be under one presbyterial government: proved by the instance of the Church of Jerusalem." Afterwards, the Assembly discussed the Church of Ephesus, and from April 25th the debate wandered over such points as the power of congregations, the division and distribution of congregations, etc. On the 3rd of May there arose one of those little points which the Assembly dearly enjoyed debating. What formed an eldership? The Assembly was disposed to resolve that "one at least" should join

with the minister in ruling. The Scottish Commissioners did not approve of that. "How can there be," said Henderson, "an eldership where there is but one elder?" A keen debate followed. Says Lightfoot, "The debate raught to a great length and to a little distaste of the Scots" (p. 261). The result of the discussion was that the Assembly ruled that "in every congregation there ought to be one at the least to labour in the word and doctrine and to rule," but with him others to join in government and take care of the poor, "the number of each of which is to be proportioned according to the condition of the congregation" (cf. Gillespie, *Notes*, p. 58).

64. It will not tend to clearness in reviewing the work of the Assembly to follow it in all its detail, and one must be content to pass over many of the prolonged discussions. The power, for instance, "of officers in particular congregations to keep from the sacrament authoritatively and to excommunicate," involved large questions which were debated fully, and which will meet us afterwards in connection with the Erastian debates. The discussion of these questions began in the middle of May, and on May 23rd it was decided that "authoritative suspension of a person not yet cast out of the Church is agreeable to the Scripture." The debates were on May 17th varied by a fast. There had come from the Earl of Essex a special request that supplication should be made for the armies. The Assembly gladly acceded to this request. To Baillie that 17th of May was the sweetest day ever seen in England! "We spent from nine to five very graciously. After Dr. Twisse had begun with a briefe prayer, Mr. Marshall prayed large two houres most divinelie, confessing the sins of the members of the Assemblie

in a wonderfullie pathetick and prudent way. After, Mr. Arrowsmith preached one houre, then a psalme; thereafter, Mr. Vines prayed near two houres, and Mr. Palmer preached one houre, and Mr. Seaman prayed near two houres, then a psalme. After, Mr. Hendersone brought them to a short sweet conference of the heart confessed in the Assemblie, and other seen faults, to be remedied, and the conveniencie to preach against all sects, especiallie Anabaptists and Antinomians. Dr. Twisse closed with a short prayer and blessing. God was so evidentlie in all this exercise, that we expect certainlie a blessing both in our matter of the Assemblie and whole Kingdome" (*Letters*, ii. 184 f.).

65. In September and October of the same year (1644) the Assembly had under discussion the sorts of Assemblies in the government of the Church. On November 8th all that the Assembly had as yet finished on the matter of Church government was read over and sent up to Parliament. Probably Parliament had now received from the Assembly all that is included in the "Form of Church Government" in editions of the "Confession of Faith," etc. The work had been sent up in two parts, the Ordination part and the Church Government part. In the Scottish edition of 1647, to which reference has already been made (§ 52), the title of the whole is: "Propositions concerning Church Government and Ordination of Ministers." At the foot of page 16 of that edition there is this note: "Some other particulars concerning Church government do yet remain unfinished, which shall be with all convenient speed prepared and presented to this Honourable House." By the phrase "some other particulars" must be meant specially the matter of *Church Censures*. This, however, was never included in the "Form of Church Government," but has

an important place in the "Directory for Church Government." The question of *Church Censures*, introducing the debates over Erastianism, will be considered in connection with the "Directory for Church Government."

66. The controversy with the Independents now assumed a new phase. If we note some of the events which were taking place outside the Assembly, it will be clear how the controversy between the Independents and the Presbyterians was influenced. The Scottish army had crossed the Border on January 19th, 1644. There were 21,000 men in the army, but its movements were singularly slow. How Robert Baillie yearned that that army would hasten its movements! For while it remained inactive, sectarianism was growing rapidly. The English army was a hotbed of dissent, and Oliver Cromwell was its master. The Assembly itself was somehow in ill savour. It was being freely said that the Assembly "did cry down the truth with votes, and was an anti-Christian meeting which would erect a Presbytery worse than Bishops" (Baillie). Lightfoot also tells us that reports were abroad that "we carry all things in a tumultuous way and over voting." As the English army became strong, the disinclination for Presbyterianism became more marked. On July 2nd the battle of Marston Moor was fought. Cromwell became the hero of the hour, and the star of Independency was in the ascendant. But the Assembly was resolved not to allow their labours to be wasted, at least not without some vigorous action. Complaints against Anabaptists, Antinomians, and "the terrible hydra of sects" were showered on Parliament. Hill and Palmer thundered before the Houses, "laid well about them," as Baillie quaintly puts it, "and charged public and parliamentary

sins strictly on the backs of the guilty" (ii. 221). These measures were partially successful, and probably would have had greater results had it not been for Oliver Cromwell. On September 13th, 1644, Cromwell obtained an order from the House of Commons, referring to the Grand Committee from the Houses and the Assembly the question of toleration for the Independents. The order meant that an effort should be made to secure an agreement between the Independents and the Presbyterians, and if that could not be secured, then a toleration clause. Baillie shows us how deeply he and others were affected. They saw clearly enough that what Cromwell wanted was *toleration;* but Baillie puts it strongly enough when he says, "The great shott of Crômwell and Vane is to have a libertie for all religions, without any exceptions" (ii. 230).

67. This Committee did not succeed in bringing the Independents and the Presbyterians into agreement, but certainly it advanced the cause of Toleration. In the reports and discussions of the Committee the principles of both parties came out very clearly. For instance, it was made clear by the Independents that they would not have communion with any Church in England, because they required in a congregation members who showed "such signs of true grace as persuaded the whole congregation of their true regeneration." This Committee for Accommodation came to nothing. But the Independents saw quite clearly how much sympathy they had, not in Parliament only, but in the army and among the people. Accordingly they resolved to avail themselves of a provision in the Ordinance calling the Assembly, that if difference of opinion among the divines should arise they were "to represent the same, together with the reasons thereof, to both or either the said Houses respectively."

Lightfoot tells us that on the 7th of November "the Independents began to talk of sending in dissenting reasons." A week later these reasons were submitted—"some eight sheets of paper." A committee of the Assembly was appointed to consider and answer these. The reasons of dissent, along with very extensive answers, ultimately formed a large volume. The whole was submitted to Parliament, and by Parliament was at last ordered to be printed on January 24th, 1648. The Scottish reprint was in 1648. In 1652 the reasons of dissent and answers were reprinted, with the new title, "The Grand Debate concerning Presbytery and Independency by the Assembly of Divines." The hapless controversy was not quite ended even with these reasons and their copious answers. The Assembly apparently was anxious that the Independents should state frankly and positively what the form of Church government in their judgment ought to be. To this the Independents agreed. Seven months elapsed before they submitted anything; and then all that the Assembly received was (to quote Baillie's wrathful words) "a sheet or two of injurious reasons why they would not give us any declaration of their tenets" (ii. 318). A committee was, of course, appointed to answer "that libel" (Baillie). The answer is in a quarto volume of 24 pages (reprinted, Edinburgh, 1646). In the end of 1645 the Committee for Accommodation was revived by Parliament, but its proceedings were fruitless.

68. Many reflections arise when one begins to review this controversy. Some of these may be stated briefly. It is impossible, for one thing, in all fairness to lay the blame wholly on the Presbyterians for the failure in securing a common platform of Church government. It may be freely granted that the Presbyterians did not

altogether understand Toleration; but it is equally clear that the Independents did not understand it, as was proved by historic experiences in New England. Nor is it possible to acquit the Independents of tactics which were singularly obstructive and sometimes singularly irritating. No one can study the accounts of the Assembly's deliberations in an unbiassed spirit without admitting that. Of course, with the light which history has brought us, no one could reasonably object to the Independents seeking Toleration, and no one could sympathise with objections made to their obtaining it. But, on the other hand, it must be said that the Presbyterians were prepared to give a much larger Toleration to the Independents than to the abnormal sects of the time; and if Presbyterianism had become the settled Church government of the country, it is more than likely that Independency would have been generously treated. It is perfectly correct that the Presbyterians did not understand absolute Toleration, though they have told us that "God alone is Lord of the conscience"; but it is incorrect to say that they did not understand a limited Toleration. To assert, as Dr. Fairbairn has done, that "to the Presbyterians Toleration was the very man of sin,"[1] or, with Masson, that "Toleration to them was a demon, a chimera, the Great Diana of the Independents,"[2] is to make one-sided and unguarded statements. Extreme views were not cherished by men like Alexander Henderson or the Presbyterian leaders in the Assembly; and these men must not be judged by outrageous fanatics like Edwards. The Presbyterians made a clear distinction between the Independents and those *sectaries* whose appearance called forth their religious horror and

[1] Article "Independency," *Encyc. Britannica.*
[2] *Milton*, iii. 383.

sometimes their unjustifiable zeal. When all is said, Presbyterianism did not sin against known light. Perfect Toleration was a principle evolved in the pain and travail of history, and the times that we treat of had little more than dreamed of it.

CHAPTER VIII.

DIRECTORIES: ERASTIANISM: PSALM-BOOK.

SECTIONS 69–84.

69. The Directory for Church Government.
70. The Directory for Public Worship.
71. Reception of the Directory in Scotland.
72. Erastianism.
73. Conflict of Assembly with Parliament: Scandalous Offences.
74. Petitions to Parliament: Ordinances.
75. Propositions of Parliament.
76. Spiritual Independence at stake.
77. *Jus divinum* Queries.
78. Answers to these Queries.
79. Gillespie, Rutherfurd, and Coleman.
80. The Psalm-book.
81. Rous's Version.
82. Rous's Version adopted and revised.
83. The Revision of Rous's Version adopted and further revised in Scotland.
84. Illustration of Rous's Version.

CHAPTER VIII.

DIRECTORIES: ERASTIANISM: PSALM-BOOK.

69. We have already seen that the Directory for Ordination was presented to Parliament on April 20th, 1644, and the leading propositions on Church government on November 8th of the same year. There was one great question not included among these propositions, namely, the question of *Church Censures*. The Assembly's resolutions on this important subject were incorporated in a "Directory for Church Government," presented to Parliament July 7th, 1645. On December 27th, 1644, Baillie says, "What remains of the Government, concerning the hard questions of excommunication, Mr. Hendersone has drawn it up by way of a practicall directorie." Lightfoot also informs us of the intention of the Assembly "to make a Directory especially of the exercise of discipline." This Directory seems to have had its origin in the desire to present the form of Church government in the most useful and practical way possible. It is evident that Henderson was specially concerned about this Directory, labouring to make it acceptable to Independents and Erastians. Neither appear to have liked it, and the Erastians insisted on an appeal from the national Assembly to Parliament. In August 1648 the Directory "was substantially embodied in the Ordinance passed by both Houses," and was published under the

title, "The Form of Church Government to be used in the Church of England and Ireland." The Directory was carried down to Scotland in 1647, and the Scottish edition of that date has on the title-page the remark, "To be examined against the next General Assembly." At the Revolution settlement, the Directory was passed by and ignored.

70. A better known Directory now claims our attention. "The Directory for Public Worship" was all prepared during the debates on Church government, and must have often proved a welcome relief from the always animated and sometimes bitter controversies of that time. Lightfoot in his *Journal*, under date May 21st, 1644, tells us that Rutherfurd moved for the *speeding* of the Directory for Worship. From this it is clear that the Directory was begun and under consideration. A committee had, very early in the Assembly's proceedings, been empowered to deal with this subject. The committee met on December 15th, 1643. Baillie tells us that at this meeting a sub-committee was appointed "of five, without exclusion of anie of the committee to meet with us of Scotland for preparing a Directorie of Worship" (ii. 118). At the earlier meetings of the sub-committee there were a few troublesome incidents. For instance, at the first meeting Goodwin "incontinent assayed to turn all upside down, to reason against all directories, and our verie first grounds, also that all prefaceing was unlawfull" (ii. 123). Baillie was the more disappointed as Goodwin was "of manie excellent parts." However, these matters were smoothed over, and the work proceeded. The Scottish Commissioners received the work of presenting "the matter of all the prayers of the Sabbath day" (Baillie, ii. 131). Afterwards "it was laid on us to draw up a Directorie for both Sacraments: on Mr.

Marshall for preaching; on Mr. Palmer for catechising; on Mr. Young for reading of Scriptures and singing of psalms; on Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Herle for fasting and thanksgiving" (ii. 140). At last, on May 24th, 1644, the first report of the Directory Committee was presented to the Assembly. During the most of that year discussions took place on the Directory, and reports were handed in. By the end of the year (December 27th, 1644) Parliament had received the whole of the Directory. After a slight revision it was passed by the House of Commons, and an Ordinance issued for its establishment. The House of Lords followed suit on January 4th, 1645, and the Directory became law.

71. The Directory was taken down to Scotland by Gillespie and Baillie. On February 3rd, 1645, by an Act of Assembly, and on February 6th by an Act of Parliament, the Directory for Public Worship became law. The rare original Scottish edition was printed in 1645, probably from the English edition of March 1645. There is evidence to show that the Scottish General Assembly very carefully considered this Directory, and adopted it only after anxious discussion and thought. The General Assembly's Act in establishing it shows that clearly. The Directory was meant simply to make known "the general heads, the sense and scope of the Prayers and other parts of Public Worship," and, if need be, "to give a help and furniture." It remains to be added that the Act of Parliament recognising the Directory was annulled at the Restoration, and that the work has never since been acknowledged by a civil authority in Scotland. It has, however, been over and over again recommended by General Assemblies; and at the present day worship in Presbyterian Churches is conducted to a very large

extent on the admirable lines of the Westminster Assembly's Directory.[1]

72. Another interesting feature of the Assembly was the ERASTIAN controversy, of which hints have already been given. The principle of Erastianism, briefly put, was the all-supremacy of the State. The Church was a mere department of the State; the pastoral office was simply persuasive; ministers had no power to excommunicate or punish. In this time of revolt or of reaction from ecclesiastical tyranny, Erastianism was naturally strong. Its representatives in the Assembly were few, Coleman, Lightfoot, and Selden; but they were among the ablest in that remarkable gathering. In Parliament, however, the Erastians were all-powerful. The fear of once more falling under the *power* of an ecclesiastical organisation made the English Parliament cling to its Erastianism. Though the same fear had not been felt so strongly in Scotland, it had been felt, and the Scottish ministry and theologians had applied themselves to the study of the question. In Gillespie and Rutherfurd the Westminster Assembly had two theologians thoroughly acquainted with the details of the Erastian controversy, and so learned in the question that the books they wrote on it were recognised as among the foremost of the time.

73. The Erastian question had always been coming to the surface, even among the earliest of the Assembly's discussions. For instance, on January 8th, 1644, when the power of pastors was being discussed, Selden made the remark that "very much may be said to prove that there is no excommunication at all." Over Matt. xviii. 17, as has been seen, Selden made a remarkable speech,

[1] Compare Leishman's edition of the *Directory* (Edinburgh and London, 1868). A copy of the rare Scottish edition of 1645 is in the Library of the United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

and the occasion is memorable for Gillespie's effective reply. During the latter part of 1644 and the early part of 1645 there were many debates over the contested points. The "Directory for Church Government," when completed, taught in the clearest way the autonomy of the Church and the right of office-bearers to the power of the keys. Just before the Directory was completed the Assembly resolved to petition Parliament. The result of this first petition was that the House of Commons required a detailed enumeration of everything included under the terms "ignorant and scandalous." The Assembly in reply declared that no one should be admitted to communion without a competent understanding of the doctrines of the Trinity, of the Deity, of the state of man by his creation and by his fall, of redemption by Jesus Christ, and the means to apply Christ and His benefits; of the necessity of faith, repentance, and a godly life; of the nature and use of the Sacraments, and of the condition of man after this life. Upon this, the House of Commons wished to know what was meant by "a competent understanding." The Assembly at once replied.

74. Numerous communications about "scandalous offences" passed between the Assembly and the House of Commons. Probably the catalogue of these offences was not complete until the beginning of 1646. Parliament, however, still delayed issuing regulations for the suspension of the ignorant and the scandalous. On August 1st, 1645, the Assembly again petitioned Parliament. The petition was opposed in the Assembly by the learned Coleman. Another petition was sent to the House of Commons on August 8th, and to the House of Lords on the 12th. While these petitions did not move the Houses from the Erastian position they had taken

up, they at least induced Parliament to publish certain Ordinances and resolutions which they had agreed on. On August 19th, directions for the choice of elders were published, and on October 20th there was issued an Ordinance with the following title: "An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, together with rules and directions concerning suspension from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in cases of ignorance and scandal. Also, the names of such ministers and others that are appointed triers and judges of the ability of elders in the twelve classes within the province of London. . . . 21st October 1645." One matter stated in the Ordinance inevitably gave rise to trouble. It was stated in these words: "If any person suspended from the Lord's Table shall find himself grieved with the proceedings before the eldership of any congregation, he shall have liberty to appeal to the classical eldership, and from them to the provincial Assembly, from thence to the national, and *from thence to the Parliament*" (Ordinance, p. 7). And again: "And it is further ordained that the members of both Houses that now are members of the Assembly of Divines, or any seven of them, be a standing committee of both Houses of Parliament, to consider of causes of suspension from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, not contained in this Ordinance; unto which committee any eldership shall present such causes to the end that the Parliament, if need require, may hear and determine the same."

75. In consequence of such clauses in the Ordinance, Parliament was flooded with petitions—from the Common Council of London, from the City ministers, and so on. Parliament was incited to action. On February 20th and 26th, 1646, resolutions were issued, supplementing the directions of August 19th, on the choice of elders.

On March 14th an all-comprehensive Ordinance was published. In twenty-three propositions the substance was laid down of everything requisite for the organisation of Presbyterial Church Government. The Ordinance has the following title: "An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, for keeping of scandalous persons from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the enabling of congregations for the choice of elders, and supplying of defects in former Ordinances and declarations of Parliament concerning Church Government . . . March 16th, 1645–46." The preamble of the Ordinance gives a short *résumé* of what had been done in the matter of Church government. Long ago, it is said, "the fundaments of government" had been arranged, and the only difficulty remaining had been about the administration of the Lord's Supper. "Parliament," it is said, "was bound in justice as well to take care that none be injuriously detained from that Ordinance, as to give powers whereby such may be kept away who are unfit to partake therein." So the resolutions were published. The most important from the point of view of the Assembly was the fourteenth: "That *in every province* persons shall be chosen by the Houses of Parliament that shall be commissioners to judge of scandalous offences (not enumerated in any Ordinance of Parliament) to them presented" (p. 10).

76. The Assembly recognised that in these resolutions and Ordinances, and in the whole attitude of Parliament, the spiritual independence of the Church was deeply involved. The members of the Assembly were unwilling to give up the struggle without some further effort. Baillie tells us how greatly the Presbyterians were perturbed over the Ordinance of Parliament. "We for our part mind to give in a remonstrance against it; the

Assemblie will doe the like; the City ministers will give the third; bot that which by God's help may prove most effectual is the zeale of the City itselfe. Before the Ordinance came out, they petitioned against some materialls of it. This both the Houses voted to be a breach of their priviledge, to offer a petition against anything that is in debate before them, till once it be concluded and come abroad. This vote the City takes very evill: it's likelie to go high betwixt them. Our prayers and endeavours are for wisdome and courage to the City." This letter was written to Dickson in Scotland on March 17th. In a postscript, written on the 31st, Baillie says: "Our great hope on earth, the City of London, has played nipshott; they are speaking of dissolving the Assembly" (ii. 361, 362). Probably the failure of the City was due to its reconciliation with Parliament at a dinner given by the City to the Houses over the news of the defeat of the Royalist forces.

77. The Assembly, however, took energetic action. On March 20th, Marshall moved that a petition be prepared. A committee was appointed to draw up the petition, which was done the same day; and after a few alterations, the petition was approved of. A committee of the whole Assembly, with Marshall as spokesman, was appointed to lay the petition before Parliament. The memorable scene, which has been described as "the crisis of the Assembly,"[1] took place on the morning of Monday, March 23rd, when, at the head of the Assembly, Marshall laid the petition before Parliament. In the petition the Assembly asserted the divine right of Church officers to deal with spiritual scandals and offences, and asked "that the several elderships may be sufficiently

[1] Bittinger, *Princeton Review*, July 1876, p. 403.

enabled to keep back all such as are notoriously scandalous from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."[1] The House of Commons gave a poor reception to the petitioners. On the 11th of April it was decided by a majority of twelve that the Assembly had been guilty of a breach of privilege. A narrative, with a statement of the particulars of the breach of privilege, was ordered to be prepared by a committee, of which Selden and Vane were members. Along with the narrative, nine queries on the *jus divinum* of Church government were drawn up. The narrative, along with the queries, was ready on April 21st, and on April 30th the Assembly was acquainted with the particulars of its breach of privilege, and was presented with the nine *jus divinum* queries. Through strong speeches an effort was made to impress the Assembly with a proper sense of its most dangerous and unhappy conduct.

78. The Assembly's action at this crisis of its conflict with Parliament was highly dignified. There was no angry word spoken; only a calm and dignified adjournment. On the following day, arrangements were at once made for entering upon "the great business" of answering the *jus divinum* queries. A day of humiliation and prayer was also fixed. So with prayer and patience, deeply humbled because of its shortcomings, yet deeply convinced of the truth of its contentions, the Assembly proceeded to its work. A long, wearisome, and somewhat thankless task it was. It continued on to July 22nd, when an order arrived from the House of Commons "to desire the Assembly to hasten the perfecting of the Confession of Faith and Catechism." A better understanding had been arrived at between the Houses and

[1] The petition will be found in the published *Minutes* of the Assembly, pp. 209–211.

the Assembly. Perhaps the events taking place outside had made it clear to Parliament that there was a limit to their treatment of the Presbyterians and the Scottish Commissioners. Oliver Cromwell had been the hero of Marston Moor, and his Ironsides were now carrying all before them. In the battle of Naseby (June 14th, 1645) the King's power was shattered. The meteoric career of Montrose terminated at Philiphaugh on September 13th. Though all was lost for Charles, the war continued burning itself out. Charles determined on a dramatic move. On April 27th, 1646, he quietly slipped out of Oxford: on the 5th of May he wended his flight to the Scottish army at Newark. A new situation was at once created; but for the moment the advantage lay with the Presbyterians. On the 3rd of June 1646 an Ordinance was ratified by Parliament, abolishing the provincial commissioners and substituting a general Commission for all England of about a hundred and eighty members of both Houses. On the 9th of June the work of erecting Presbyteries was ordered to be begun.

79. A few points in connection with the Erastian controversy remain to be noted. It is probable that the answers to the *jus divinum* queries were never completed by the Assembly. Anyhow, it is likely that the answers of the Assembly were incorporated, doubtless with the Assembly's consent, by several London ministers in their *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici.* Baillie, who describes this as "a very fine book," tells us that it was published on December 1st, 1646 (*Letters*, ii. 411). Some reference might also be made to the controversy between Gillespie and Coleman. The controversy was partly literary, and partly carried on through debate in the Assembly. One fruit of the Erastian debate was Gillespie's great work, *Aaron's Rod-Blossoming; or, The*

Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated. The book was published in 1646, for on July 30th of that year we find Gillespie presenting his work to the Assembly (*Minutes*, p. 261). There was also a great debate between Rutherfurd and Gillespie, chiefly, on the one side, and Coleman, almost alone, on the other. It was over the vital proposition, "That Jesus Christ, as King and Head of His Church, hath appointed an ecclesiastical government in His Church, distinct from the civil government." The argument on this proposition began on 9th March 1646 and continued to the 18th, when Coleman was absent ill. Coleman did not get better, and on the 30th the members of Assembly attended his funeral. The debate on the proposition was resumed by Lightfoot on April 3rd. At last, on July 7th, the proposition was passed as part of the answer to the first of the nine *jus divinum* queries: "for the negative, Mr. Lightfoot." When the Confession of Faith was compiled, the proposition was inserted with a few changes as part of chap. xxx.

80. Before we pass to the labours of the Westminster Assembly on their Confession of Faith and Catechisms, some reference must be made to the work of the Assembly on the PSALTER. A peculiar interest attaches to the Assembly's work on the metrical version of the Psalms, and it is too often forgotten how much in Scotland we owe to the Assembly in this matter. Certainly, the revision of the Psalter had a minor place in the deliberations of the Assembly; but, on the other hand, no work of these learned divines has led in a deeper sense to that *Uniformity* which they so longed and laboured for. The history of the metrical version of the Psalms may be said to date from the reign of Edward VI., and is associated with the honoured name

of Thomas Sternhold, who died in 1549. In England the version of Sternhold ran through many editions, augmented and supplemented by Hopkins, Keith, and others, until in 1696 it was superseded by the version of Tate and Brady. In Scotland, Sternhold's version was also made the basis of further development. The Scottish Liturgy was first printed at Geneva in 1556; and in it there are only fifty-one Psalms; but in the edition of 1565 the whole of the Psalms are found, the version being practically that of Sternhold as supplemented by Hopkins and others. This was the old Scottish Psalter, and for eighty-five years it continued to be the version used in Scotland. King James' version of 1631 in no way interfered with the place of the old Psalter, and in the revulsion of feeling in 1637 the version of King James suffered along with the ill-fated Liturgy of Charles I. and Laud.

81. The question of a Psalm-book was obviously one which the Westminster Assembly might profitably consider. Accordingly we find that on November 20th, 1643, the House of Commons passed the resolution, "That the Assembly of Divines be desired to give their advice, whether it may not be useful and profitable to the Church that the Psalms set forth by Mr. Rous be permitted to be publicly sung, the same being read before singing until the Books be more generally dispersed." From Lightfoot's *Journal* we find that this order was handed in on November 22nd, and the work committed to the three committees, each of them taking fifty Psalms (p. 60). This metrical version by Francis Rous had been published in 1643. Rous himself was born at Halton, Cornwall, in 1579. In the Long Parliament he was a very prominent member, and in the Westminster Assembly he was one of the lay Commissioners, honoured

by all. Baillie, who had great delight in his friendship, describes him as "an olde, most honest member of the House of Commons." He died in 1658. Rous's version was not the only one before the country at the time. There was a version by the well-known Zachary Boyd; one, unpublished, by Sir William Mure of Rowallan; and one by a certain William Barton, which he himself very persistently brought to the front, and which the House of Lords for some reason or other took warmly to.

82. On September 12th, 1645, the *Minutes* of the Assembly declare as follows: "The Assembly doth humbly advise and desire that those Psalms set forth by Mr. Rouse, with such alterations as are made by the committee of the Assembly appointed to review it, may be profitably sung in churches, as being useful and profitable to the Church" (p. 131). On November 14th, 1645, the version, as altered and amended, was presented to the House of Commons, who took the version into consideration. On April 15th, 1646, the House of Commons ordered the book to be printed, and to be sung "in all churches and chapels within the kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed." Unfortunately, the House of Lords had not as yet signified their approval of this version. They desired to support the claims of Barton, and on October 7th, 1645, they referred the version to the Assembly. The Assembly replied on 14th November, stating that they highly approved of "the very good and commendable pains which Mr. Barton had taken with his metaphrase," but that they really saw no reason why it should be preferred to Rous's version. In March, the Lords again approached the Assembly to ask whether those who wished to use them could not use Barton's Psalms as well as other

translations. The Assembly, in reply (April 25th, 1646), appealed to the good sense of the House of Lords, pointing out what a hindrance and distraction to edification it would be if more than one translation were in use at the same time. Ultimately the House of Lords yielded on the point.

83. The General Assembly of Scotland, through its Commissioners, had been deeply interested in the preparation of a Psalter. But before adopting Rous's version the Assembly determined on a closer acquaintance with it, especially in view of the fact that they had already an honoured Psalm-book, besides the competing versions of Zachary Boyd and Sir William Mure of Rowallan. However, the Scottish Church did not receive the Psalm-book until February 1647. On the 23rd of that month the Commissioners wrote to Edinburgh as follows: "We now send you the new edition of the Paraphrase of the Psalms as it was approved by the Assembly here and by yourselves, the animadversions which you sent us being taken in in their proper places." The Commissioners added that "one Psalm-book in the three kingdoms will be a considerable part of Uniformity, if it can be fully agreed upon both there and here." The Commissioners of the Scottish General Assembly had some difficulty in getting copies sufficient to send down to their Presbyteries. This difficulty was at last overcome; but on August 28th, 1647, the General Assembly declared that "it was very necessary that the Paraphrase sent from England should be yet revised." So the work of revision was entered upon. It was a most careful revision. Committees were appointed; Presbyteries were consulted, the Presbyteries being specially instructed that "it was not enough to find out faults, except they also set down their own essay correcting the same." The

work lasted a long time, but at last, on November 23rd, 1649, the General Assembly's Commission issued an Act discharging all old versions, and appointing the new version to be used in congregations and families after the first day of May 1650. The Committee of Estates approved of this on January 8th, 1650. The utmost care had been bestowed in the revision of Rous's version; but the labour has been justified in the warm place the Psalm-book has taken in Scotland and elsewhere.

84. An illustration may be given of the Scottish revision of Rous's version (as revised and amended by the Westminster Assembly):

"The man is blest that in th' advice
Of those that wicked are
Walks not nor stands in sinners' path
Nor sits in scorner's chaire."
—(Rous: Edition 1646.)

"That man hath perfect blessednesse,
Who walketh not astray
In counsell of ungodly men,
Nor stands in sinners' way."
—(Scottish Revision, 1650.)

"The Lord my shephard is, I shall
Not want; He makes me ly
In pastures green, me leads by streams
That do run quietly."
—(Rous: Edition 1646).

"The Lord's my shepherd, I'le not want:
He makes me down to ly
In pastures green: He leadeth me
The quiet waters by."
—(Scottish Revision, 1650.) [1]

[1] Much information on the versions and revisions of the Psalm-book will be found in a valuable article in Laing's edition of Baillie's *Letters and Journals*, iii. 525–556.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

SECTIONS 85–94.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

85. It is scarcely possible to understand the theological standpoint of the Confession of Faith without some knowledge of the trend of theological thought in the century which preceded its formation. It will not, however, be necessary to say much on this point, for it has been shown repeatedly that the whole drift of English theology from the Reformation to the times of Laud was distinctly Augustinian or Calvinistic. Indeed, before the Reformation English theology had been enriched by the Augustinian contributions to it of men like Bradwardine, Anselm of Canterbury, Wycliffe, and Tyndale. At the Reformation, English theology was deeply coloured, not only by intercourse between English and Continental reformers, but by the writings which came across and found a ready market in Britain. The minds of English theologians were profoundly influenced by Calvin. In the controversy over the Lord's Supper they sided with Calvin; and in the matter of predestination they clung to his view much more sympathetically than to the supralapsarian views of his successor, Theodore Beza. The *Thirteen Articles* drawn up in the reign of Henry viii. (1538) were influenced by the Augsburg Confession (1530), and are plainly Augustinian. In the following reign a greater formula was made. The *Forty-two Articles* of 1553 are unquestionably

Augustinian. These Articles, revised in the reign of Elizabeth, and known as the Thirty-nine Articles, still remain the Creed of the English Church. One Article (the 17th Article) has sometimes been wrested into an Arminian interpretation, but the attempt cannot be looked upon as other than a failure. Other clear proofs that the theology of England down to the time of Laud was thoroughly Calvinistic may be found in the Lambeth Articles (1595), the Irish Articles (1615), and the decisions of the Synod of Dort (1618–19), at which there were representatives of English theology. It may be said, then, that English theology from the Reformation on to 1643 was profoundly Calvinistic; and the Calvinism generally was of a *moderate* type, on the question of predestination being "within the limits of infralapsarianism, which puts the fall under a *permissive* decree." The aim of the Westminster Assembly was simply to reassert this Calvinism, which had been so obscured by the Arminianism and the sacerdotalism of the school of Laud.

86. If we turn to Scottish theological thought, we shall find that it, too, was distinctly *Calvinistic*. It is sometimes assumed that Scottish Calvinism was of a high or extreme type. Principal Fairbairn, for instance, has remarked, in a paper on the Westminster Confession, that "Scottish theological thought was pronounced supralapsarianism" (*Contemporary Review*, vol. xxi.). One hesitates in accepting such a judgment. The evidence for it is not by any means conclusive. Hamilton, Wishart, and Knox had been intimately connected with early Lutheranism and with Calvinism; and it is certainly remarkable that the Scotch Confession of 1560 ignores the decree of reprobation. Further, if any man left his impress deep on Scottish theology, it was Mel-

ville; and it is admitted that his Calvinism was of the moderate or infralapsarian type. When the reaction set in against the Arminianism of Laud, there were unquestionably many who advocated extreme Calvinistic views. Of these Rutherfurd may be regarded as a type. But the evidence appears to show that these were not in a majority; and when the debates of the Scottish Assembly came over the Westminster Confession of Faith, it is interesting to find Baillie saying, that "it would be his endeavour that our Assembly meddle not with such subtle questions, but leave them to the schools" (iii. 6). Apart from that, however, it is clear that the drift of English and Scottish theology was, on the whole, towards a Calvinism which may be pronounced as generally of a *moderate* type. It is this Calvinism which we find reasserted in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

87. At this point we may give the history of the framing of the Confession of Faith by the Assembly. Writing to Scotland in October 1644, Baillie tells us that "the Confession of Faith is referred to a committee to be put in several of the best hands that are here" (ii. 232). Lightfoot gives us some additional information. On August 20th, 1644, we learn that Palmer reported from the Grand Committee desiring "a committee to join with the Commissioners of Scotland to draw up a Confession of Faith" (Lightfoot, p. 305). A committee of nine was accordingly appointed, namely, "Dr. Gouge, Mr. Gataker, Mr. Arrowsmith, Dr. Temple, Mr. Burroughes, Dr. Burgess, Mr. Vines, Mr. Goodwin, and Dr. Hoyle." On September 4th, we further find that Dr. Temple, chairman of the committee for the drawing up of a Confession of Faith, desired that that committee might be augmented, which was done accordingly (Lightfoot, p. 308). The

names added to the committee were "Mr. Palmer, Mr. Newcomen, Mr. Herle, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Tuckney, Dr. Smith, Mr. Young, Mr. Ley, and Mr. Sedgwicke" (*Minutes*, p. lxxxvii.). Apart from a few hints in Baillie's *Letters*, we hear no more of the Confession until May of the following year. In a letter of November 21st, 1644, Baillie tells us he is afraid the Confession will "stick a good while longer"; and on December 26th he writes as follows: "I think we must either passe the Confession to another season, or, if God will help us, the heads of it being distribute among many able hands, it may in a short time be so drawn up, as the debates of it may cost little time. All this chalking is on the supposition of God's singular assistance" (ii. 248). A third reference is on April 25th, 1645: "The Catechise and Confession of Faith are put in the hands of severall committees, and some reports are made to the Assembly concerning both" (p. 266). The committee appointed in 1644 made its report on May 12th, 1645, whereupon a small committee was appointed to draw up the first draft of the Confession. This committee consisted of Gataker, Harris, Temple, Burgess, Reynolds, Hoyle, Herle, along with the Scottish Commissioners. The committee made reports from time to time, and on the 8th of July an important committee was appointed "to take care of the wording of the Confession of Faith, as it is voted in the Assembly from time to time, and to report to the Assembly when they think fit there should be any alteration in the words. They are first to consult with the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, or one of them, before they report to the Assembly" (*Minutes*, p. 110). On the 11th of July it was agreed that the body (*i.e.* the heads) of the Confession should be divided among the three committees of the Assembly. This division was made on

July 16th; another division of subjects on November 18th; a final division on February 23rd, 1646.

88. The Assembly, as a whole, was engaged on the Confession, more or less, from July 7th, 1645, to December 4th, 1646. There were many interruptions. There were, for instance, meetings devoted to the classification of scandalous offences, and there were the months wasted over the *jus divinum* queries. Some of the debates were animated, as, for instance, the great debates on the Decree (especially October 20th to 24th, 1645), on Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience, and on the Headship of Christ. On the whole there was marvellous unanimity. Coleman, of course, fought out the subject of Church Censures till death took him; Lightfoot continued the debate, though less eagerly. The Independents did not agree on the point of "Synods and Councils": so on August 11th, 1646, "Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Nye did enter their dissent." On September 4th, 1645, Dr. Burgess dissented from the finding of the Assembly to omit the epithet "Blessed" before the name of the Virgin. On September 9th, Lightfoot entered his dissent from the expression used of Christ, "suffering grievous torments in soul." Or, to take another instance, on September 23rd, 1646, Whitaker dissented from the expression "foreordained to everlasting death." But, on the whole, the unanimity was remarkable, and the Assembly would certainly have much sooner put "the copestone on their wonderful work," and justified Baillie's most sanguine expectations, had not their energies been crippled by the *jus divinum* queries. These queries vexed the Assembly greatly, but at last relief came. On July 22nd, 1646, there came an order "to hasten perfecting of the Confession of Faith and Catechism." On September 25th, part of the Confession was sent up to

Parliament. On November 26th it was finished, with the exception of the preface and certain amendments. These were completed by December 4th, on which day the Confession was presented to the House of Commons. But Parliament required *proof passages*, and the preparation and discussion of these continued down to April 1647. On April 29th, 1647, the Confession, with Scripture proofs, was presented to both Houses. The House of Commons ordered 600 copies to be printed, solely for the members of Parliament and the Assembly. The title of these is: "The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, . . . concerning a Confession of Faith; with the Quotations and Texts of Scripture adduced. London, 1647."

89. The treatment of the Confession by the English Parliament was characteristic. The Confession had been presented to it in April 1647, but it was only on June 20th, 1648, that Parliament adopted the Confession, with the following title: "Articles of Christian Religion, approved and passed by both Houses of Parliament, after advice had with the Assembly of Divines, by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster." The alterations made by Parliament were mainly *omissions*, namely, omission of chap. xxx. on "Church Censures"; chap. xxxi. on "Synods and Councils"; paragraph 4 of chap. xx. on "Censures of the Church" and power of "Civil Magistrate" in certain cases; paragraphs 5 and 6, and part of paragraph 4 of chap. xxiv. on "Marriage and Divorce." It ought to be added, however, that the Parliament of 1660 approved of all the Confession, except chaps. xxx. and xxxi.

90. The reception which the Confession received in Scotland was most cordial. Baillie brought it down with

him in January 1647, and handed it, along with the Psalm-book, to the Commissioners of the General Assembly. In his letter of 26th January, written from Edinburgh, he says, "The third point of Uniformity, the Confession of Faith, I brought it with me, now in print, as it wes offered to the Houses by the Assemblie, without considerable dissent of any. It's much cryed up by all, even many of our greatest opposites, as the best Confession yet extant" (iii. 2). The Assembly of 1647 passed an Act unanimously approving of the Confession of Faith. This Act was ratified by Parliament on February 7th, 1649. In 1661 the Act was, of course, rescinded; but, in the Scottish Parliament of 1690, the Confession of Faith was once more ratified. (See further, Note A, appended to this chapter.)

91. In a short history of the Westminster Assembly it will not be necessary to examine in detail either the form which the Confession of Faith takes, or the theological matter of which it is composed. But a few points fall to be noticed. The first concerns the *mould* on which the Confession was fashioned. This has been proved, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to be those Articles drawn up by Ussher in 1615, and known as the IRISH ARTICLES.[1] The proof has often been given in elaborate and detailed form; but a simple and convincing method of showing the dependence of the Confession on the Articles of 1615 is by comparing the headings of the chapters as reported in the Assembly for discussion with a few of the headings of the Irish Articles and of the Westminster Confession:

[1] Mitchell, *Lecture on Confession of Faith* (1866), also *Introduction to Minutes*; Schaff, *History of Creeds*; Briggs, *Presbyterian Review*, January 1880.

Irish Articles.	*Heads given in by Committee.*	*Westminster Confession.*
i. Of the Holy Scripture and the Three Creeds.	The Scriptures.	i. Of the Holy Scripture.
ii. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.	God and the Holy Trinity.	ii. Of God and the Holy Trinity.
iii. Of God's Eternal Decree and Predestination.	God's Decrees, Predestination, Election, etc.[1]	iii. Of God's Eternal Decree.
iv. Of the Creation and Government of all things.	The Works of Creation and Providence.	iv. Of Creation. v. Of Providence.
v. Of the Fall of Man, Original Sin, and the State of Man before Justification.	Man's Fall, Sin and the Punishment thereof, Free-will.	vi. Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment thereof. vii. Of God's Covenant with Man.
vi. Of Christ the Mediator of the Second Covenant.	The Covenant of Grace, Christ our Mediator.	viii. Of Christ the Mediator. ix. Of Free-will.

Or a comparison might be made between the Irish Articles and the Westminster Confession in their method of treating a particular doctrine. One example will suffice. "Of God's Eternal Decree and Predestination" the Articles of 1615 say: "God from all eternity did, by His unchangeable counsel, ordain whatsoever in time should come to pass; yet so, as thereby no violence is offered to the wills of the reasonable creatures, and neither the liberty nor the contingency of second causes is taken away, but established rather." The Confession of Faith puts it: "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass: yet so, as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

92. Another interesting point in connection with the Confession of Faith is the question of its sources, or rather of that general theological scheme under which the Westminster divines grouped their leading doctrines.

The scheme is known as *Federal Theology*, or the Theology of the Covenants. To whom were the Assembly divines indebted for this conception of the two Covenants of Works and of Grace? The reply is often made that the conception came to them from Holland; and it is too often assumed that the conception is one for which the Church is indebted to Cocceius. It is forgotten that Cocceius' chief work was not published till 1648, before which time the Westminster divines had certainly developed their theology. Dr. Rainy has stated the real truth in words which may be quoted: "The Federal Theology grew on British soil as much, to say the least, as on Dutch. And the imagination which has got into various historical books that it was invented by Cocceius is a pure delusion" (*Catholic Presbyterian*, September 1883, p. 191). The theological idea has been traced to Bullinger. It was developed in 1585 by Olevianus. It appeared in 1596 in a treatise by Principal Rollock, published in Edinburgh. In England the idea appeared in the works of Cartwright and Davenant, while in the famous *Medulla* of Amesius it has a distinct place. Finally, Ball's great treatise on the *Covenant of Grace* was published shortly after the Assembly met. The proof is conclusive that the Federal Theology, as taught in the Westminster Standards, was a theological conception which not merely had come to consciousness in England and Scotland before the Assembly met, but had reached the place it occupied in the living thought of the Church largely through native inquiry and speculation.[1]

93. Apart, then, from the question of the mould on

[1] Apart from general works on the *History of Doctrine*, reference ought to be made to two valuable papers by Dr. Rainy in the *Catholic Presbyterian*, May and December 1881.

which the Confession was formed, and the question of the general theological scheme which the Confession follows, namely, Federal Theology, it will not be necessary to analyse further the Confession of Faith.[1] Controversies have, time and again, arisen round various sections of the Confession, and in the lapse of generations the Church has seen fit to declare officially her interpretation of certain Articles, such, for instance, as those which concern the love of God, foreordination, the problem of the heathen, and Toleration.[2] Yet it cannot but be frankly admitted that, as a statement of Reformed doctrine and as a declaration of seventeenth century Calvinism, the Confession of Faith is a most moderate and judicious document. How admirably cautious and fair, for instance, is that chapter on *Holy Scripture*, over which the Assembly took the very greatest pains, and to which Dean Stanley gave the warmest encomium (*Contemporary Review*, August 1874). Equally cautious and moderate is the chapter on *God's Eternal Decree*, modelled so closely on the Irish Articles, and even more cautious. When it is contrasted with the Canons of the Synod of Dort, the moderateness and caution of this Article are apparent. On the point of the Extent of Redemption, whether *universal* or whether *limited*, it is a fine question whether the Confession has given a specific determination, or whether its Articles were intentionally framed so that those who held the liberal view could, in that sense, accept them. There was, as has been often pointed out, a strong body of opinion in the Assembly that Christ

[1] Reference might be made to *Commentaries* such as those of Hodge and of Macpherson (Bible Class Handbook: T. & T. Clark).

[2] The interpretations of the Church on the sections which deal with the Civil Magistrate will be found in Taylor Innes' *Law of Creeds in Scotland* (Edin. 1867; 2nd edition, 1902).

did intend to die for all men. It was supported by men like Calamy, Seaman, Vines, Marshall, and Arrowsmith, and some of these spoke very strongly in favour of the liberal view. It is hardly conceivable that this view was specifically rejected; and, indeed, when chap. vii. § 3 is compared with chap. viii. § 8, it will be found that a considerable concession is made to the school of Davenant and Calamy. Reference might also be made to the Assembly's declaration on *Infant Salvation*, as it has sometimes been said that here the divines abandoned their usual caution and moderation, and taught the salvation of elect infants only. The evidence for such a view is very far from conclusive, and, after examining the point in its historical setting, one heartily accepts the statement of the *Declaratory Act* (1892) of the Free Church of Scotland, "Nor is the Confession to be held as teaching that any who die in infancy are lost."[1]

94. It must be allowed, then, that the Confession of Faith is admirably judicious and moderate. Certainly, the Assembly divines had not the light which, in the course of time, the Spirit of God has brought to the Church of Christ. Certainly, for instance, they did not understand Toleration as it is understood to-day; although one must be ever thankful that they sounded a note which went farther than they knew, when they declared that "*God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it in matters of faith and worship.*" It is true, also, that the point of view of theology has changed, and with a

[1] Reference might be made to interesting discussions of this point by Briggs (*Presbyterian Review*, October 1883); Mitchell, *Westminster Assembly*, pp. 397 ff.; Hodge and Macpherson in their *Commentaries* on the Confession of Faith.

new point of view many old truths have assumed new aspects, which the living mind of the Church cannot refrain from emphasising. The Person of Christ dominates our theology. "Modern theology," said Schaff at the First Presbyterian Council, "is neither Solifidian nor Predestinarian nor Sacramentarian, but Christological. The pivot . . . is the great mystery of God manifest in the flesh." This fact we are thankful for. We can rejoice in it, while, at the same time, we can thank God for that wise and judicious statement of our faith which has come down to us as a precious heritage from the Westminster Assembly.[1]

NOTE A.—*Spiritual Independence.*

The adoption of the Westminster Confession by the Scottish Church in 1647 deserves some further comment in addition to what is said in the text in § 90. It was an act highly illustrative of that "inherent legislative power" which the Scottish Church has consistently claimed, and which on more than one occasion has brought the Church into conflict with the State and civil law. As a vivid illustration of the claim made in Scotland that the Church possesses what Dr. Chalmers called "a certain inherent liberty," in virtue of her subjection to Christ as her only Head and His word as her only standard, the approval and adoption of the Westminster Confession in 1647 by the Scottish Church deserves the most careful study.

i. What is the claim of the Scottish Church? It is that the Church is a living body, distinct and apart from the State, with powers conferred upon her directly by Christ, and with a liberty which Christ gives her to

[1] A discussion of points referred to in the text in §§ 93 and 94, which have become recently matters of intense living interest, will be found in Note B, appended to this chapter.

interpret for herself the mind of Christ, and exercise authority in spiritual matters. Nowhere is this possession of "inherent liberty" more forcibly stated than in the *Claim of Right* which preceded the Disruption in 1843. One passage may be quoted, as it is an accurate historical description of a specific difference between the Churches of Scotland and England in regard to spiritual independence: "But all such power, and all claim on the part of the Sovereign to be considered supreme governor over the subjects of this Kingdom of Scotland in causes ecclesiastical and spiritual, as he is in causes civil and temporal, was, after a long-continued struggle, finally and expressly repudiated and cast out of the constitution of Scotland, as inconsistent with the Presbyterian Church government established at the Revolution and thereafter unalterably secured by the Treaty of Union with England; by the constitution of which latter Kingdom, differing in this respect from that of Scotland, the Sovereign is recognised to be supreme governor 'as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things and causes as temporal.'"

ii. In the exercise of this claim "to possess legislative power and to exercise legislative change in its own spiritual region," the Scottish Church in 1560 adopted a Confession of Faith; and this Confession remained from 1560 to 1567 the Creed of a Church without Parliamentary ratification. The Scottish Church was glad to accept Parliamentary ratification; but in accepting it, the Church did not move from its position of "inherent liberty." The attitude which Knox, its foremost and most representative man, took up may be gathered from his statement about the refusal of the Court in France to ratify the Confession: "No ratification brought he unto us. But that we little regarded, nor yet do regard; for all that we did was rather to show our dutiful obedience, than to beg of them any strength to our religion, which from God has full power, and needeth not the suffrage of man, but in so far as man hath need to believe it, if that ever he shall have participation of the life everlasting."

The Scottish Confession of 1560 is a document of the

first importance, not merely as a statement of Reformation faith, but as an indication of the spirit which has all down through its history been characteristic of the Scottish Church. The Confession of 1560 struck a note to which the Church has remained true. And though the Scottish Church in 1647 accepted a new Confession, laying aside in the exercise of her inherent liberty the Scottish Confession of 1560, nevertheless it ought to be remembered that the Church accepted the new Confession as carrying out the spirit of the old, and as in no way inconsistent with it.

In this light it is most striking to find the Confession of 1560 so clearly declaring its *fallibility*. The words ought never to be forgotten: "Protestand that gif onie man will note in this our confessioun onie Artickle or sentence repugnand to Gods halie word, that it wald pleis him of his gentleness and for christian charities sake to admonish us of the same in writing; and we upon our honoures and fidelitie, be Gods grace do promise unto him satisfactioun fra the mouth of God, that is, fra His haly scriptures, or else reformation of that whilk he sal prove to be amisse." This is from the preface to the Confession; but in Article XX. there are words which show clearly the sense of the Church that Councils or Synods are not to be regarded as infallible, "For plaine it is, as they wer men, so have some of them manifestlie erred, and that in matters of great weight and importance."[1] The Confession further declares that as a Church "they dared not receive *without just examination* whatsoever was obtruded unto men under the name of general Councils," and they could not reverence and embrace the determinations of any Council except in so far as they agreed with the plain word of God.

It is of profound importance to remember, what is clear from the passages quoted, that the Scottish Church from the beginning recognised the fallibility of a creed, and its subordination always to the word of God. If Councils

[1] "Confession" in full in Dunlop's *Confessions*, and Schaff's *Creeds*, vol. iii.

might err, and if into a Confession there might creep something "repugnant to God's holy word," then surely the Church was only exercising its "intrinsical power" when it declared its living mind on points of doctrine and its interpretation of Scripture. A Church which has "full power from God" to adopt a Confession of Faith, must surely in the very fact of her "inherent liberty" have the further power of *altering* in accordance with her living sense of Scripture. This is the clear Scottish Church sentiment to which the Church has protested her loyalty since the days of Knox. No doubt, circumstances may arise, and have arisen, in Scotland, in which a section of the Scottish Church is so bound by statute in its relations to the State, as to be unable to exercise "the intrinsical power" which Christ in regard to the interpretation of His mind has given to His Church.

iii. In 1647 the Scottish Church adopted the Westminster Confession. The Estates of Parliament confirmed that in 1649. The Act Rescissory, of course, swept away the Parliamentary legislation of 1649, and until 1690 the only Confession the Church had by statute was the Scottish Confession of 1560. Yet during those forty years the Scottish Church held to the Westminster Confession as *the Confession of the Church* which had been adopted *by the Church* in the exercise of its "intrinsical power." Before the Scottish Church adopted the Westminster Confession, it was submitted to what the old Confession called *a just examination.* The Act of the General Assembly, 27th August 1647, adopting and approving the Confession of Faith, is an important document.[1] It shows the care which the Church took in adopting the Westminster Confession; how it was twice read over, examined, and considered; how every opportunity was given for the statement and examination of doubts and objections; and how at last it was adopted as being "agreeable to the word of God, and in nothing

[1] Taylor Innes, *Law of Creeds in Scotland*, edition 1867, pp. 61 ff., 95 f.; Mitchell, *Minutes of Westminster Assembly*, pp. 419 f. Cf. also *Free Church of Scotland Appeals* (R. L. Orr), p. 377.

contrary to the received doctrine, worship, discipline, and government" of the Church. A further reason for its warm approval lay in the hope, so fervently cherished by the Scottish Church, that it might prove a basis for uniformity in religion within the three kingdoms. The Church, in thus carefully deliberating and ultimately approving, showed quite clearly its sense of "the inherent liberty" which belonged to it as the body of Christ. And this appeared still further in the reservations which the Church made in adopting the Westminster Confession. Indeed, the Act of 1647 is a Declaratory Act on two points, and on these two points it is an express modification of the Westminster Confession. The first point is a declaration in favour of Presbyterian Church government, which is not specially mentioned in the Confession; and the second point is a declaration of the meaning which the Church is prepared to put on "the power of the civil magistrate" in the calling of Synods and Assemblies. Further, the Church declares its freedom to meet in Assemblies or synodically, without the consent of the magistrate, "by the intrinsical power received from Christ."

In addition, it goes without saying that the Westminster Confession was a document of very different character from the Scottish Confession of Faith. Both are most loyal to the substance of the Reformed faith, though there is a certain pristine vigour in the Scottish Confession which the later one lacks. The theological scheme or plan of doctrine which is worked out in the Westminster Confession is more scholastic and refined than the simple evangelical statements of the Confession of 1560. But those who adopted the Confession of 1647 felt and said that it was in harmony with the Confession of 1560 ("in nothing contrary to the received doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this Kirk"); and this is of considerable importance in connection with the doctrine of Election, for the Westminster Confession, in contrast with the Scottish Confession, does not use the word *reprobate* in its Article on Election. The Scottish

Assembly of 1647 felt that the Westminster Confession was conceived in the spirit of the Confession of 1560, asserting the liberty of the Church to live, and her subordination to Christ as her only Head and to His word as her only standard. And while the Scottish Church in 1647 carefully safeguarded her position in declaring her view of certain matters in the Westminster Confession, still she gladly adopted that Confession by virtue of "her intrinsical power," passing by minor matters on which there might be differences of opinion, in order to secure that uniformity which she conceived to be the will of God, and for which already she had made great sacrifices.

It is unnecessary to point out how important the adoption by the Scottish Church of the Westminster Confession is in connection with her claim for complete spiritual independence. The Church in Scotland has all along made claim to exercise legislative power in spiritual matters, always, of course, in a constitutional way. This claim involved the Church's liberty to interpret the mind of Christ, and declare her interpretation of confessional statements in accordance with her living sense of Scripture, her only standard. The claim was continuously and consistently made within a State Church from 1560 to 1843. It was then declared by a majority of judges that a Church established by statute did not really possess this "complete freedom." Surely, to say the least, the claim was intensified by the national sacrifice of 1843, and the formation of the Free Church then. If the "complete freedom" claimed by the Church was denied to a Church limited by statute, it is not very clear how it could be denied to a Church non-established and free; and if the claim to be spiritually free and to adjust her creed to the living conscience of the Church was not made distinctly and *specifically* in a constitution for the Free Church, surely it was made sufficiently clear by the Church's action and deeds.

Note.—The attitude of the Church in Scotland to her subordinate standards and the liberty which is claimed in regard to them, have

rarely been stated more clearly and emphatically than by George Gillespie, whose opinion is of the greatest weight. Gillespie had perhaps the keenest theological mind of all the Scottish Commissioners at the Westminster Assembly. Gillespie's views will be found in chapter x. of his *Treatise of Miscellany Questions*. In this chapter he specially deals with the objection that "to establish by the law of the land a Confession of Faith . . . is to hold out and shut the door against new light." A sentence or two may be quoted. "It ought to be our desire and endeavour to grow in the knowledge of the mind of Christ, to follow on to know the Lord, to seek after more and more light." "It is the duty, not only of particular Christians, but of reforming, yea reformed, yea the best reformed Churches, whensoever any error in their doctrine or any evil in their Government or form of worship shall be demonstrated to them from the Word of God . . . to take in and not shut out further light, to embrace the will of Christ held forth to them, and to amend what is amiss being discovered unto them" (Edinburgh, 1649, pp. 124 f.). The *Treatise of Miscellany Questions* has been reprinted in the *Presbyterian Armoury*, vol. ii., and an epitome of Gillespie's views will be found in Bannerman's *Church of Christ*, vol. i. p. 308. Bannerman's own view (*Church of Christ*, vol. i. pp. 303–309) is in line with Gillespie's. The following sentence almost at the close of the *Treatise of Miscellany Questions* shows how the thoughts of the Declaratory Act of 1892 are not so far out of touch with the seventeenth century as some would have us believe: "Christ receiveth all who come unto Him, and excludeth none but such as by their unbelief exclude themselves, John vi. 37" (Edinburgh, 1649, p. 288).

Note B.—*The Confession of Faith and the Free Church of Scotland Declaratory Act*, 1892.

A. In addition to what is stated generally in §§ 93 and 94, something ought to be said about the theological affirmations of the Westminster Confession in reference particularly to the doctrine of Election. The doctrine of the Confession on this point has been set in a most vivid light by the decision of the House of Lords in the *Free Church of Scotland Appeals* case on August 1st, 1904. That decision has made the confessional doctrine more particularly on predestination a matter of intense and living interest, not for Scotland only, but for the whole religious world.

It is not necessary here to describe in detail the historical situation in Scotland which led up to the Appeal to the House of Lords. Of recent years in Scotland the Churches have felt that while they willingly accepted the Westminster Confession as a theological standard under Scripture, there were aspects of truth which, though latent in the Confession, had not received the place which the living mind of the Church was disposed to give them; and, on the other hand, there were statements in the Confession which, while of living interest to the seventeenth century, did not in the same way appeal to the modern conscience, and were capable of serious misinterpretation. In 1879 the United Presbyterian Church passed a Declaratory Act, in which that Church very clearly stated her interpretation of the confessional doctrines of Redemption, Election, etc. In the exercise of what she claimed to be her "inherent liberty," the Free Church of Scotland in 1892 passed a Declaratory Act dealing with the same matters, on which, thirteen years before, the United Presbyterian Church had felt it necessary to declare her mind. The Declaratory Act of 1892 must be here quoted in full:

"Whereas it is expedient to remove difficulties and scruples which have been felt by some in reference to the declaration of belief required from persons who receive licence or are admitted to office in this Church, the General Assembly, with consent of Presbyteries, declare as follows:

"That, in holding and teaching, according to the Confession, the Divine purpose of grace towards those who are saved, and the execution of that purpose in time, this Church most earnestly proclaims, as standing in the forefront of the revelation of Grace, the love of God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—to sinners of mankind, manifested especially in the Father's gift of the Son to be the Saviour of the world, in the coming of the Son to offer Himself a propitiation for sin, and in the striving of the Holy Spirit with men to bring them to repentance.

"That this Church also holds that all who hear the Gospel are warranted and required to believe to the

saving of their souls; and that in the case of such as do not believe, but perish in their sins, the issue is due to their own rejection of the Gospel call. That this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin.

"That it is the duty of those who believe, and one end of their calling by God, to make known the Gospel to all men everywhere for the obedience of faith. And that while the Gospel is the ordinary means of salvation for those to whom it is made known, yet it does not follow, nor is the Confession to be held as teaching, that any who die in infancy are lost, or that God may not extend His mercy, for Christ's sake, and by His Holy Spirit, to those who are beyond the reach of these means, as it may seem good to Him, according to the riches of His grace.

"That, in holding and teaching, according to the Confession of Faith, the corruption of man's whole nature as fallen, this Church also maintains that there remain tokens of his greatness as created in the image of God; that he possesses a knowledge of God and of duty; that he is responsible for compliance with the moral law and with the Gospel; and that, although unable without the aid of the Holy Spirit to return to God, he is yet capable of affections and actions which in themselves are virtuous and praiseworthy.

"That this Church disclaims intolerant or persecuting principle, and does not consider her office-bearers, in subscribing the Confession, committed to any principles inconsistent with liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment.

"That while diversity of opinion is recognised in this Church on such points in the Confession as do not enter into the substance of the Reformed Faith therein set forth, the Church retains full authority to determine, in any case which may arise, what points fall within this description, and thus to guard against any abuse of this liberty to the detriment of sound doctrine, or to the injury of her unity and peace.

This was the Act passed in 1892. The Act was not passed unanimously; a small section seceded to form the Free Presbyterian Church, and a number within the Church remained in membership and office under protest. A further step was taken in 1900. In the exercise of what she claimed to be her inherent liberty and spiritual independence, the Free Church agreed to unite with the United Presbyterian Church. The Union was brought about, not for one moment under the influence of any political or ulterior motives, but under the pressure of the conviction that such a Union was the will of the living and sole Head of the Church. No doubt, also, the result was in some measure due to forces which were operating toward Union among the evangelical Churches of Christendom. A very small minority of the Church refused to enter the Union, and appealed to the civil Courts, claiming that they and they alone represented the principles on which the Free Church was founded, and were therefore entitled to the Church's property. In Scotland, the civil Courts unanimously held that the Free Church, on the basis of Union agreed upon, was entitled to enter on Union with the United Presbyterian Church, and to retain her property. An appeal was made to the House of Lords, which by a majority decided in favour of the minority, holding that in 1843 a Trust had been established on a certain basis, and that in entering on Union with the United Presbyterian Church the principles of the Trust had been violated.

i. Now, the only point which concerns us here, in connection with this momentous decision, is its bearing on the affirmations of the Westminster Confession. Lord Halsbury, the Lord Chancellor, who gave the leading judgment in favour of sustaining the appeal from the decisions of the Scottish Courts, declared emphatically that the Free Church in passing its Declaratory Act in 1892 had departed from the theological standpoint of the Westminster Confession, and on the point of Predestination particularly, which the counsel for the minority, the "Free Church," had brought before him, that the state-

ment in the Declaratory Act of 1892 was inconsistent with and opposed to the doctrine of the Confession. The two statements which he put alongside each other as inconsistent were:

(1) Confession of Faith, chap. iii.:

> "iii. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death."
>
> "iv. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished."

(2) Declaratory Act, 1892:

> "That this Church also holds that all who hear the Gospel are warranted and required to believe to the saving of their souls; and that in the case of such as do not believe, but perish in their sins, the issue is due to their own rejection of the Gospel call. That this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin."

With the opinion of the Lord Chancellor on the inconsistency in doctrine Lord Davey agreed. It was not disputed by the others who formed the majority in the House of Lords, Lord Alverstone simply saying that he refrained from expressing "a final opinion."

ii. The judgment thus expressed and supported by a considerable show of learning raises many interesting questions, some of them bearing very directly on the labours of the Westminster Assembly.

The argument of the Lord Chancellor, not merely in the judgment which he has given, but in his discussion with counsel during the hearing of the case, is that the Declaratory Act is an Arminian statement, and therefore inconsistent with a statement of Calvinism such as could

only come from an Assembly in the first half of the seventeenth century.[1]

1. Now, in dealing with an argument of this nature, it must, to begin with, be admitted that the Westminster Confession in its doctrine of Election is undoubtedly a Calvinistic document; but it must, on the other hand, be maintained that the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession is a moderate Calvinism, demonstrably and intentionally moderate. All the native British confessional statements, coloured as they are with Reformed theology, are Calvinistic. It is impossible to read Arminianism into the 17th Article of the Thirty-nine Articles, which clearly teaches "a free eternal election in Christ."[2] More strongly Calvinistic are the Lambeth Articles (1595), the Irish Articles (1615), and the Canons of the Synod of Dort, at which there were British representatives (1618–1619). Though those confessional statements preceding the Westminster Confession are strongly Calvinistic, they are all well "within the limits of infralapsarianism, which puts the Fall under a *permissive* decree, and makes man alone responsible for sin and condemnation." No Reformed confessional statement is supralapsarian.[3]

[1] One may be allowed to say that it is a very serious reflection upon a Church, which is admitted to possess some of the most competent theologians of modern times, that it has produced an Arminian Declaratory Act, while in the formula which its ministers sign on ordination it specifically disowns all Arminian doctrines and tenets! It is a pity that the House of Lords did not have the evidence of a few theological experts!

[2] It is difficult knowing what evidence the Lord Chancellor had for the following statement during the hearing of the case: "The Westminster divines had those Articles (*i.e.* the Thirty-nine Articles) before them, and one by one discussed them, and they altered the 17th Article to the matter as it now stands." As a matter of fact, the Assembly divines revised only fifteen of these Articles. Historical accuracy was not over-prominent on the Bench during the hearing of this case. A minor instance is the twice-repeated statement of the Lord Chancellor that "two Scotch divines and one English bishop attended the Synod of Dort" (see *Free Church of Scotland Appeals*, R. L. Orr, pp. 488, 496, 506).

[3] Van Oosterzee (*Dogmatics*, p. 452) makes one exception in the *Helvetic Consensus Formula;* but this is doubtful (see Schaff, *History of Creeds*, p. 635).

2. Now, it can be shown that, though the Westminster Confession came after the statements referred to, it follows the Irish Articles in a more moderate Calvinism than the Articles of Lambeth, and it is more moderate than the Canons of the Synod of Dort. For instance, in contrast with the Lambeth Articles and the Canons of the Synod of Dort, the Westminster Confession makes no reference to a *decree of reprobation.* Further, the Assembly did not dogmatise on the question whether there was only one decree. That question was specially left open in order that "every one might enjoy his own sense" (Gillespie, see *Minutes*, p. 151). It is perfectly clear to one who reads carefully the minutes of the debates in the Assembly on these high matters of theology, that the Westminster divines were most anxious to secure a *comprehensive* scheme of doctrine, and to draw up a Confession on which all might agree, and which might prove a basis for uniformity. Hence, for instance, they were prepared to accept the advice of one of their most sagacious members, "Let us not put in disputes and scholastical things into a Confession of Faith" (Reynolds, *Minutes*, p. 151). And hence, also, as I most strongly believe, such men as Twisse the Prolocutor, and Rutherfurd the scholastic Scottish theologian, were prepared to accept a confessional statement into which they could read their high Calvinistic doctrine, but which did not specifically exclude the views of a broader school, so worthily represented in the Assembly by men such as Arrowsmith and Calamy.

3. This becomes clearer when one studies the minutes of the debate on the question of the extent of the Atonement. Did Christ die that all men might have an opportunity of salvation, or did He die simply to secure the salvation of the elect? It is perfectly clear, even from the truncated minutes of the great debate on October 22nd, 1645, that there was a most influential party in the Assembly who believed strongly in what might be called an *effective* election for some, coupled with an *intention* on the part of God and of Christ in

His death to effect the salvation of all. They accepted the position of Davenant, made clear at the Synod of Dort and elsewhere. They were glad to count themselves disciples of one "cujus memoria apud orthodoxos in benedictione sempiterna permanebit" (Arrowsmith). Arrowsmith delighted to quote such words by Davenant as these, "No man is created by God with a nature and quality fitting him to damnation."[1] It does not appear from the minutes that Arrowsmith took part in the great debate on October 22nd, 1645; but a very remarkable speech was made by Calamy. "I am far," he said, "from universal redemption in the Arminian sense; but that that I hold is in the sense of our divines in the Synod of Dort, that Christ did pay a price for all,—absolute intention for the elect, conditional intention for the reprobate in case they do believe,—that all men should be *salvabiles, non obstante lapsu Adami*, . . . that Jesus Christ did not only die sufficiently for all, but God did intend in giving of Christ, and Christ in giving Himself did intend to put all men in a state of salvation in case they do believe." Calamy laid great stress on John iii. 16. The word "world," he said, signified the *whole world*. "It cannot be meant of the elect because of that *whosoever believeth*, and, Mark xvi. 15, 'Go, preach the gospel to every creature'" (*Minutes*, pp. 152–156). To the same effect Seaman argued, "All in the first Adam were made liable to damnation, so all liable to salvation in the second Adam" (*Minutes*, p. 154).

4. Now, it is hardly conceivable that the Westminster Assembly, when one remembers its desire to secure a comprehensive formula as a basis of Uniformity, should have framed a Confession deliberately to exclude the view of such an influential section of its members. It is to be presumed rather that the Confession should have been such as men of the Davenant school would accept,—while asserting the Biblical doctrine of Election, placing alongside that the other Biblical doctrine, that God in

[1] Mitchell, *Minutes of Assembly*, p. lxii.; Schaff, *History of Creeds*, p. 771.

His grace desired the salvation of the world, and that the responsibility of accepting or refusing God's offer lay with men. It is difficult to imagine how otherwise the Westminster Assembly could have constructed its Confession. Certainly, the doctrine of the divine Election could have received no other place but the foremost. That was the living thought of the age, which construed its theology not from the person of Christ, but from the idea of a Sovereign God. But the other element was there, and a careful reading of the Confession brings it to light. While the Confession asserts the divine decree, it places alongside that "the freedom of the human will," a high mystery belonging to the science of Faith. "Nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established" (chap. iii. § 1, ix. § 1). Further, while the Confession declares (chap. iii. § 6, viii. § 8) that only the elect are "redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved," it says distinctly in chap. iii. § 7, that "God was pleased to pass by the rest of mankind . . . and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath *for their sin.*" Further, there is the great passage in chap. vii. § 3, in which it is stated that "the Lord was pleased to make a second covenant, commonly called the Covenant of Grace: wherein He freely offered unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ." Finally, in the last chapter of the Confession, chap. xxxiii., the wicked who go away unto judgment are defined as those "who know not God, and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ."

iii. Now, when it is said that the Declaratory Act of 1892 is inconsistent with the Confession of Faith, stress may be laid chiefly on two features of that Act: first, the free offer of the gospel to all sinners; and secondly, the declaration that "this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin." The contention of the Lord Chancellor was that the Free Church, in declaring her mind on these two points, was

departing from Calvinism and accepting *Arminianism.* Is the free offer of the gospel to all sinners an Arminian tenet? It is not necessary to describe Arminianism in answering such a question: it is sufficient to point to three facts:

(*a*) Reference has often been made to Calvin's own words when commenting on John iii. 16: "Such is also the import of the term *world*, which he formerly used; for though nothing will be found in the world that is worthy of the favour of God, yet He shows Himself to be reconciled to the whole world when He invites all men without exception (*sine exceptione omnes*) to the faith of Christ, which is nothing else than an entrance into life."

(*b*) A high place has always been given among the Standards of the Free Church of Scotland to the little work called *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, a work produced in Scotland, and contemporaneous with the Westminster Confession. This little work repeatedly refers to the "offer of grace to all sinners," a truth which it holds in harmony with a doctrine of efficacious grace for the elect. "Here," it says, "the Lord . . . maketh open offer of Christ and His grace, by proclamation of a free and gracious market of righteousness and salvation, to be had through Christ to every soul, without exception, that truly desires to be saved from sin and wrath: 'Ho, every one that thirsteth,' saith He, He inviteth all sinners."

(*c*) Finally, it may be said that no faithful preacher in the Scottish Church, certainly not in the Free Church, has ever forgotten that the Gospel was for all sinners. It may be allowable to refer to Dr. Chalmers, certainly the greatest of Scottish preachers in the last century, and a man whose name is inextricably linked with the founding of the Free Church. Dr. Chalmers was a professed Calvinist, and repeatedly disclaimed Arminianism. A passage ought not to be forgotten which occurs in his *Institutes of Theology*: "There is not an Arminian or Universalist who contends more zealously than we for the duty of the preacher to urge the offers of the

Gospel upon every man, and the duty of every man to accept of these offers. God has made the salvation of the Gospel universal in point of proposition: the fault is man's if it be not universal in point of effect." Dr. Chalmers remained true to this belief. Amongst his last words, recorded in Dr. Hanna's *Life*, are these: "In the offer of the Gospel we must make no limitation whatever."[1] *That is the teaching of the Declaratory Act.*

It may be said, however, that the taint of Arminianism lies in the declaration of 1892, that "this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin." A sufficient answer to that lies in certain declarations of the Synod of Dort (November 13th, 1618, to May 9th, 1619), which was convened specifically to deal with Arminianism, and declared *in toto* against that doctrine. It is expressly declared by the Synod that the fault in refusing the offer of the Gospel lies with men themselves.[2] In the conclusion to its canons the Synod denounced as a calumny, which the Reformed Churches detested with their whole soul, "that God by a mere arbitrary act of His will, *without the least respect or view to any sin*, has predestinated the greatest part of the world to eternal damnation, and has created them for this very purpose."[3] Thus the Declaratory Act, on the evidence of the anti-Arminian Synod of Dort, falls into line with the Calvinism of the Reformed Churches, when it refuses to regard the Confession of Faith "as teaching the foreordination of men to death *irrespective of their own sin.*"

B. The truth of the matter, therefore, appears to be that the Declaratory Act is by no means inconsistent with the affirmations of the Westminster Confession. It simply lays stress on an aspect of truth which is present in the Confession of Faith, but does not there receive the emphasis which the living mind of the Church is disposed to give to it.

[1] *Memoirs*, iv. 512 (1852).
[2] Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. 589.
[3] Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. 596.

CHAPTER X.

THE CATECHISMS: CLOSE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

SECTIONS 95–103.

CHAPTER X.

THE CATECHISMS: CLOSE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

95. On December 15th, 1643, a committee was appointed in connection with the preparation of the Directory for Public Worship. This committee consisted of Marshall, Palmer, Herle, Young, Goodwin, along with the Scottish Commissioners. Palmer was asked to prepare a report on *Catechising*, as Marshall was requested to prepare one on *Preaching*, the one, according to Robert Baillie, being the best catechist, and the other the best preacher in England. When given in, neither of the reports pleased the Scottish Commissioners who received the papers to revise. The committee, however, which had been appointed was not a committee for drafting a Catechism, and there is consequently considerable difficulty in explaining some references in Baillie's *Letters*. In October 1644 he writes: "Wee are in hopes to gett the Directorie brought towards an end, and the Catechise also ere long." On November 21st, "The Catechise is drawn up, and I think shall not take up much tyme." On December 26th, 1644, "We have near also agreed in private on a draught of Catechise, whereupon when it comes in publick, we expect little debate." Probably the explanation of these references is that Palmer was not only preparing a paper on Catechising, but, along with the Scottish Commissioners, was drawing up a Catechism as well. On December 2nd, 1644, anyhow,

"Marshall, Tuckney, Newcomen, and Hill were added to Palmer for *hastening* the Catechism" (*Minutes*, p. 13). Reynolds and Delmy were added to the committee on February 7th, 1645. The committee made a report on May 13th. A long and interesting debate followed on the *method* of catechising, and from the debate it is clear that the committee had given in a report on the method of catechising, and probably along with the paper on catechising they had submitted a draft of a Catechism, whether on Palmer's method or not is uncertain. Anyhow the method of catechising proposed was clearly Palmer's. An illustration of Palmer's method may be given from his own *Catechism*, published in 1640:

"What is man's greatest business in this world?		*Answer.* A man's greatest business in this world is to glorify God and save his own soul: 1 Cor. vi. 20, x. 31; Matt. xvi. 26."
Is it to follow the world and live as he list?	No.	
Or, is it to glorify God and save his own soul?	Yes.	

96. The peculiarities of the method are apparent. On the whole, the discussion on May 13th went against it; but, strangely enough, the Scottish Commissioners, who had originally expressed little liking for the method, were now Palmer's warmest supporters. On thinking over it, they had come to admire the method, and, as Gillespie told the Assembly in the debate, they had been in Scotland, and there the method had been warmly approved of. But, on the whole, the Assembly did not much like it. On the 1st of August, accordingly, we find Palmer making a second report to the Assembly, and on August 4th we find that the part of the proposed Catechism then debated was on the *Creed*. From this it becomes clear that in preparing and debating a proposed Catechism, the Assembly were working on *Palmer's own*

Catechism. Next day the debate was "concerning God," the third question in Palmer. On August 20th it was resolved that "Mr. Palmer, Dr. Stanton, and Mr. Young draw up the whole draught of the Catechism with all convenient speed and make report to the Assembly." But from this date the Assembly became absorbed in the Confession of Faith and in the *jus divinum* queries. A sentence in a letter of Baillie (July 14th, 1646) explains the dates: "We made, long agoe, a prettie progress in the Catechise; but falling on rubbes and long debates, it wes laid aside till the Confession wes ended, with resolution to have no matter in it but what wes expressed in the Confession, which should not be debated over againe in the Catechise."

97. The work of debate was resumed on September 14th, 1646, from which date sections of the Catechism were debated more or less steadily. The committee was considerably enlarged on December 1st, Tuckney in particular being then added to it. An important motion was made on January 14th, 1647: "Upon a motion made by Mr. Vines it was *ordered* that the committee for the Catechism do prepare a draught of two Catechisms, one more large and another more brief, in which they are to have an eye to the Confession of Faith, and to the matter of the Catechism already begun" (*Minutes*, p. 321). The giving in of reports and the debates on these continued until the 15th of October 1647, when the *Minutes* read, "Mr. Tuckney made report. The Catechism being finished, it was resolved, this should be transcribed to be sent to both Houses of Parliament." On the 22nd "the Larger Catechism was ordered to be sent up to both Houses of Parliament by the Prolocutor, attended with the whole Assembly" (*Minutes*, p. 485). The proofs were not given at this period, but we shall find that both

Catechisms, with proofs, were carried up to Parliament on April 14th, 1648. Thus the Larger Catechism was now drawn up. The basis of it, as has been shown in a conclusive way,[1] was Palmer's work. In regard to doctrine, the chief source was Ussher's *Body of Divinity;* and the chief share in drawing up the Catechism was evidently taken by Dr. Tuckney, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.

98. Before describing the preparation of the *Shorter Catechism*, it may save some misconception if we note what had become of the Scottish Commissioners. In his *Letters*, Robert Baillie shows us that Henderson had been far from well during 1645 and the first part of 1646. In May 1646 he had hurried north to Newcastle to treat with the King. "Mr. Hendersone is dyeing most of heart-break at Newcastle," writes Baillie on August 7th. He was able, however, to be conveyed to Edinburgh, and there, on August 19th, just one month after Twisse, the Prolocutor of the Assembly, Alexander Henderson died. As for Baillie, the Confession of Faith was little more than finished when, on December 25th, 1646, he bade farewell to the Westminster Assembly. "I leave," he said, "my best wishes with the whole company, and with every one of my dear and gracious brethren." "And for our reverend brother," said Herle, the Prolocutor, "we have many and hearty thanks" (*Minutes*, p. 473). Privately, Baillie confesses himself "over-wearied with the insufferable tediousness of this Parliament and Assemblie" (*Letters*, ii. 415). He had not spoken much, but he had found that "silence was a matter of no reproach and of great ease, and brought no hurt to the work" (*Letters*, iii. 3). The other Commissioners were also anxious to get home. On July 16th,

[1] Briggs, *Presbyterian Review*, January 1880.

1647, Gillespie "took his leave of the Assembly, and by order of the Assembly the Prolocutor spoke unto him." The Confession of Faith, with proofs, had been presented to Parliament; but the Larger Catechism was not completed. The last of the four to leave was Rutherfurd. On the day the Larger Catechism was completed it was inscribed in the minutes, on Rutherfurd's motion, that the Assembly had enjoyed the assistance of the Commissioners during all the time of the perfecting of the four things mentioned in the Covenant, namely, the Directory for Worship, the Confession of Faith, Form of Church Government, and Catechism (*Minutes*, p. 484). On November 9th, 1647, Rutherfurd also left, after having received "thanks for the great assistance he hath afforded to this Assembly, in his constant attendance upon the debates of it" (*Minutes*, pp. 487, 488).

99. The Larger Catechism was practically complete before the Shorter was really begun. On August 5th a committee was chosen to proceed with the Shorter Catechism. The committee consisted of the Prolocutor, Palmer, Temple, Lightfoot, Green, and Delmy. On the 9th, Palmer made a report. Next day a further report was made—not by Mr. Palmer, for the Assembly would no more be brightened by the presence of "gracious and learned little Palmer," but by Dr. Temple. At various times other members were added to the committee; and it ought to be noted that on November 9th, Mr. Wallis was allowed to attend the committee, evidently as secretary. On November 25th, 1647, the Shorter Catechism was transmitted to the House of Commons, and on the following day to the House of Lords. Both Catechisms, with proofs, were presented to Parliament on April 14th, 1648, and approved on September 25th. From what has been stated in sec. 98, it is clear that the Scottish

Commissioners had practically nothing to do with the preparation of the Shorter Catechism. It has generally been supposed that the master hand in framing the concise questions and answers in the Shorter Catechism was that of Dr. John Wallis, at the time a young friend of Palmer, afterwards an eminent mathematician, who lived to be probably the last survivor of the Assembly, and a link between it and the eighteenth century.

100. In Scotland the General Assembly sanctioned the Larger Catechism on July 20th, 1648, and the Shorter on July 28th. These two Acts of Assembly were afterwards approved by Parliament, but repealed, of course, in 1661. In the Act of 1690 the Catechisms were not mentioned; but what they have lacked in official sanction they have certainly received in popular favour. More especially has this been the case with the Shorter Catechism. As Mr. Taylor Innes has so well said, "It has been for many generations the real creed of Scotland so far as the mass of the people is concerned" (*Law of Creeds*, p. 195). Much has been said in admiration of this wonderful and cherished document, which has done such a great part in the mental and spiritual training of the Scottish people. One may be excused repeating the oft-quoted words of Thomas Carlyle: "The older I grow—and I now stand upon the brink of eternity—the more comes back to me the first sentence in the Catechism which I learned when a child, and the fuller and deeper its meaning becomes: What is the chief end of man? To glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever."

101. Practically there was nothing more for the Assembly now to do; and little requires to be said about its closing days. If one had entered the Assembly in the early part of 1648, remarkable changes would have been

noted. Many well-known forms are no more in its ranks. Twisse, the Prolocutor, that "venerable man, with the long, pale countenance, imposing beard, lofty brow, and meditative eye,"[1] no longer presides over the Assembly's deliberations. In his place is Charles Herle. The Scottish Commissioners have all left. One of them, the greatest and the wisest, Alexander Henderson, has gone to the Assembly of the firstborn above; another, George Gillespie, was to follow his leader before the year (1648) was over. Jeremy Burroughes, "the morning star of Stepney," has gone from the earthly ranks of the Independents. The Erastians have lost Coleman. Palmer, "of small stature and childlike look," is no more. Many other forms are missing, and it is only too apparent that the Assembly's work is practically over. For some time, indeed, it has been clear that life and energy have gone from the Assembly. Complaints have been common about non-attendance, and some members have even begun the daring practice of reading during the sittings! The Assembly has been "dwindling away by degrees."[2] What have the few remaining members been doing? On the day Samuel Rutherfurd left, November 9th, 1647, a committee was appointed "to consider what the Assembly is to do when the Catechism is finished." During part of 1648 the Assembly devoted its energies to inconclusive labours on the *Jus Divinum* Queries, to answers to the Dissenting Brethren, and to papers on Accommodation (*Minutes*, p. 578). From June 21st, 1648, to February 22nd, 1649, the Assembly practically confined itself to examining ministers for vacant charges. The last *numbered* session was on February 22nd, 1649; but the Assembly had a nominal existence until March

[1] *Bicentenary of Assembly of Divines of Westminster*, p. 25.
[2] Fuller, *Church History*, iii. 471.

25th, 1652, as a committee for the examination of ministers.

102. Those years from 1643 to 1649, when the Assembly was sitting, and was a power in the land, were epoch-making years in the history of the English people. They were years of upheaval and of change, such as rarely occur in the lifetime of a people. Old ideas, cherished customs, rooted beliefs, were all passed in trenchant review; and no one in those eventful years could have foreseen the issue. It was a time of dreams, an age of ideals. The Throne, the Church, the very fabric of the Nation, were all shaken to their deepest depth. It was an age of conflict, the clash of arms and the clash of opinion. In those years were fought the battles, from Marston Moor to Naseby, which determined the fate of the Throne, and in part the fate of the Church. The old order was passing away. Kingcraft and priestcraft had been tried and found wanting. When the thoughts of men became free, no edifice like that of Laud, built on a *jus divinum*, buttressed by fanaticism, cemented by persecution, and crowned by intolerance,—no such edifice could endure. The Church, as a divine institution, would pass safely through the fire; but not the Church as Charles I. and Laud had tried to shape it. With the old order disappeared, not Laud only, but the monarch for whom he had dared and done so much. It was an epoch-making time for the people. In the clash of opinion ideas were struck out which bore fruit in after ages in liberty and toleration and spiritual independence. Through much tribulation the people, both of England and of Scotland, were to enter the kingdom, which in this case was to be a kingdom of larger ideas, larger institutions, larger liberty in faith and in practice. So, with the shuddering scene at Whitehall

on January 30th, 1649, let the curtain drop. When it rises, "there is neither crown nor crosier, House of Commons nor Assembly of Divines, but a soldier booted and spurred, and leaning heavily on his sword—Oliver Cromwell, afterward Lord Protector."

103. In all those years of stress and storm the Westminster Assembly bore its part, and bore it with dignity and with courage. No one who knows the Assembly will cavil at its work. In a sense that work failed. The Assembly did not realise the dream which gave such splendours of hope to its opening days. It did not realise the dream of Uniformity, or the dream of *a covenanted Church in a covenanted State.* It did not succeed in making England Presbyterian. But the Assembly did a great work in the seventeenth century. It spoke a word which has been heard round the world. It gave us symbols which to this day are moulding the religious worship and life of thousands, wherever the English-speaking people have gone. And if, perhaps, we may fail to sympathise with its theory of Church and State, or its conceptions of religious freedom, we may at least ask ourselves:

> "What hand and brain went ever paired?
> What heart alike conceived and dared?
> What act proved all its thought had been?
> What will but felt the fleshly screen?"

NOTE.—A vast mass of literature is associated with the Westminster Assembly; but the following works will be found specially useful in prosecuting the study:—Baillie, *Letters and Journals* (edited by Laing); Lightfoot, *Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines* (vol. xiii. of Pitman's edition); Gillespie, *Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines* (edited by Meek); Mitchell, *Lecture on Confession of*

Faith, Lectures on Westminster Assembly, Introduction to Minutes of Assembly, Catechisms of the Second Reformation; Hetherington, *Westminster Assembly* (edited by Williamson); Schaff, *History of the Creeds of Christendom;* Masson, *Life of Milton;* Gardiner, *History of England.*

APPENDIX.

I. Ordinance, June 12th, 1643, calling the Westminster Assembly.

II. Members of the Assembly.

III. "The Solemn League and Covenant."

IV. Robert Baillie's description of the Westminster Assembly.

APPENDIX I.

Ordinance, June 12th, 1643, calling the Westminster Assembly.

An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons *assembled in Parliament, for the calling of an Assembly of learned and godly Divines, and others, to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England; and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations.*

Whereas, amongst the infinite blessings of Almighty God upon this nation, none is or can be more dear unto us than the purity of our religion; and for that, as yet, many things remain in the Liturgy, Discipline, and Government of the Church which do necessarily require a further and more perfect reformation than as yet hath been attained; and whereas it hath been declared and resolved by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that the present Church government, by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending upon the hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation and growth of religion, and very prejudicial to the state and government of this kingdom; and that therefore they are resolved that the same shall be taken away, and that such a government shall be settled in the Church as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church

of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad; and, for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit and necessary to call an Assembly of learned, godly, and judicious Divines, who, together with some members of both the Houses of Parliament, are to consult and advise of such matters and things, touching the premises, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and to give their advice and counsel therein to both or either of the said Houses, when, and as often as they shall be thereunto required: Be it therefore ordained by the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, That all and every the persons hereafter in this present Ordinance named, that is to say,—[*See the names of members in Appendix II.*]

And such other person and persons as shall be nominated and appointed by both Houses of Parliament, or so many of them as shall not be letted by sickness, or other necessary impediment, shall meet and assemble, and are hereby required and enjoined, upon summons signed by the clerks of both Houses of Parliament, left at their several respective dwellings, to meet and assemble themselves at Westminster, in the chapel called King Henry the VII.'s Chapel, on the first day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and forty-three; and after the first meeting, being at least of the number of forty, shall from time to time sit, and be removed from place to place; and also that the said Assembly shall be dissolved in such manner as by both Houses of Parliament shall be directed; and the said persons, or so many of them as shall be so assembled or sit, shall have power and authority, and are hereby likewise enjoined, from time to time during this present Parliament, or until further order be taken by both the said Houses, to confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things touching and concerning the Liturgy, Discipline, and Government of the Church of England, or the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false asper-

sions and misconstructions, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the said Houses of Parliament, and no other; and to deliver their opinions and advices of, or touching the matters aforesaid, as shall be most agreeable to the word of God, to both or either of the said Houses, from time to time, in such manner and sort as by both or either of the said Houses of Parliament shall be required; and the same not to divulge, by printing, writing, or otherwise, without the consent of both or either House of Parliament. And be it further ordained by the authority aforesaid, that William Twisse, Doctor in Divinity, shall sit in the chair, as Prolocutor of the said Assembly; and if he happen to die, or be letted by sickness, or other necessary impediment, then such other person to be appointed in his place as shall be agreed on by both the said Houses of Parliament: And in case any difference of opinion shall happen amongst the said persons so assembled, touching any the matters that shall be proposed to them as aforesaid, that then they shall represent the same, together with the reasons thereof, to both or either the said Houses respectively, to the end such further direction may be given therein as shall be requisite in that behalf. And be it further ordained by the authority aforesaid, That, for the charges and expenses of the said Divines, and every of them, in attending the said service, there shall be allowed unto every of them that shall so attend, during the time of their said attendance, and for ten days before and ten days after, the sum of four shillings for every day, at the charges of the Commonwealth, at such time and in such manner as by both Houses of Parliament shall be appointed. And be it further ordained, That all and every the said Divines, so, as aforesaid, required and enjoined to meet and assemble, shall be freed and acquitted of and from every offence, forfeiture, penalty, loss, or damage, which shall or may arise or grow by reason of any non-residence or absence of them, or any of them, from his or their, or any of their church, churches, or cures, for or in respect of their said attendance upon the said service;

any law or statute of non-residence, or other law or statute enjoining their attendance upon their respective ministries or charges, to the contrary thereof notwithstanding. And if any of the persons before named shall happen to die before the said Assembly shall be dissolved by order of both Houses of Parliament, then such other person or persons shall be nominated and placed in the room and stead of such person or persons so dying, as by both the said Houses shall be thought fit and agreed upon; and every such person or persons, so to be named, shall have the like power and authority, freedom and acquittal to all intents and purposes, and also all such wages and allowances for the said service, during the time of his or their attendance, as to any other of the said persons in this Ordinance is by this Ordinance limited and appointed. Provided always, That this Ordinance, or anything therein contained, shall not give unto the persons aforesaid, or any of them, nor shall they in this Assembly assume to exercise any jurisdiction, power, or authority ecclesiastical whatsoever, or any other power than is herein particularly expressed.

APPENDIX II.

Members of the Westminster Assembly.[1]

Peers.

Algernon, Earl of Northumberland.
William, Earl of Bedford.
Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.
William, Earl of Salisbury.
Henry, Earl of Holland.
Edward, Earl of Manchester.
William, Lord Viscount Say and Seale.
Edward, Lord Viscount Conway.
Philip, Lord Wharton.
Edward, Lord Howard of Escrick.
Basil, Earl of Denbigh;
Oliver, Earl of Bolingbroke;
William, Lord Grey of Warke;
vice *Bedford, Holland, and Conway.*
Robert, Earl of Essex, Lord General.
Robert, Earl of Warwick, Lord High Admiral.

Commoners.

John Selden, Esq.
Francis Rous, Esq.
Edmund Prideaux, Esq.

[1] In this list the names are given in the order in which they appear in the Ordinance calling the Assembly. The names of those added after the Assembly met are in italics. Some of the members appear never to have attended; at least no record of such is found. Notes after the names are in italics, except in so far as they are found in the Ordinance. The lists appear in various histories (as, for instance, in Masson's *Milton*), but Dr. Mitchell's revision is reliable (*vide Minutes*, p. lxxxi.).

Sir Henry Vane, Kt., senior.
John Glynn, Esq., Recorder of London.
John White, Esq.
Bouldstrode Whitlocke, Esq.
Humphrey Salloway, Esq.
Mr. Sergeant Wild.
Oliver St. John, Esq., His Majesty's Solicitor.
Sir Benjamin Rudyard, Kt.
John Pym, Esq.
Sir John Clotworthy, Kt.
John Maynard, Esq.
Sir Henry Vane, Kt., junior.
William Pierpoint, Esq.
William Wheeler, Esq.
Sir Thomas Barrington, Kt.
Walter Young, Esq.
Sir John Evelyn, Kt.
Sir Robert Harley v. *Pym, deceased.*
Sir William Massam or Masson v. *Barrington, deceased.*
William Stroud v. *White, deceased.*
Sir Arthur Haselrig, Robert Reynolds, Esq., } *added along with Earl of Essex.*
Zouch Tate, Esq.
Sir Gilbert Gerrard (?).
Sir Robert Pye (?).
Sir John Cooke.
Nathaniel Fiennes (?).

DIVINES.

Herbert Palmer, B.D., of Ashwell, *Assessor after* White, *and Master of Queens' College, Cambridge.*
Oliver Bowles, B.D., of Sutton.
Henry Wilkinson, B.D., of Waddesdon.
Thomas Valentine, B.D., of Chalfont, St. Giles, *afterwards of London.*
William Twisse, D.D., of Newbury, Prolocutor.
William Raynor, of Egham.

Hannibal Gammon, M.A., of Mawgan.
Jasper or Gaspar Hickes, M.A., of Lanrake.
Joshua Hoyle, D.D., of Dublin, *afterwards of Stepney; Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.*
William Bridge, of Yarmouth.
Thomas Wincop, D.D., of Ellesworth.
Thomas Goodwin, B.D., of London, *afterwards of Magdalen College, Oxford* (*Independent leader*).
John Ley, of Budworth.
Thomas Case, of London.
John Pyne, of Bereferrers.
Francis Whidden, M.A., of Moreton.
Richard Love, D.D., of Ekington.
William Gouge, D.D., of Blackfriars, London.
Ralph Brownerigg, D.D., Bishop of Exeter (*did not attend*).
Samuel Ward, D.D., Master of Sidney Sussex College, *Cambridge.*
John White, M.A., of Dorchester, *Assessor.*
Edward Peale, of Compton.
Stephen Marshall, B.D., of Finchingfield (*Smectymnuan leader of London Presbyterians*).
Obadiah Sedgewick, B.D., of Coggeshall.
[John] Carter, M.A.
Peter Clerk, of Carnaby.
William Mew, B.D., of Easington.
Richard Capell, Pitchcombe.
Theophilus Bathurst, of Overton Watervile.
Philip Nye, of Kimbolton.
Brocket (or Peter) Smith, D.D., of Barkway.
Cornelius Burgess, D.D., of Watford, *Assessor.*
John Green, of Pencombe.
Stanley Gower, of Brampton Bryan.
Francis Taylor, of Yalding.
Thomas Wilson, of Otham.
Antony Tuckney, B.D., of Boston, *Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, after Arrowsmith.*
Thomas Coleman, of Blyton.
Charles Herle, of Winwick, *Prolocutor after Twisse.*

Richard Herrick, Manchester.
Richard Cleyton, of Shawell.
George Gibbs, of Ayleston.
Calibute Downing, LL.D., of Hackney.
Jeremy Burroughes, "*Morning Star*," of Stepney.
Edmund Calamy, B.D., London.
George Walker, B.D., London.
Joseph Carrill, M.A., Lincoln's Inn.
Lazarus Seaman, B.D.
John Harris, D.D., Warden of Winchester College.
George Morley, of Mildenkall.
Edward Reynolds, of Braunston, *afterwards Bishop of Norwich.*
Thomas Hill, B.D., of Titchmarsh.
Robert Sanderson, D.D., of Boothby Pannell, *afterwards Bishop of Lincoln.*
John Foxcroft, of Gotham.
John Jackson, M.A., of Marske.
William Carter, of London.
Thomas Thoroughgood, of Massingham.
John Arrowsmith, of King's Lynne, *afterwards Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.*
Robert Harris, B.D., of Hanwell.
Robert Crosse, B.D., of Lincoln College.
James [Ussher], Archbishop of Armagh (*did not attend*).
Matthias Styles, D.D., of St. George's, Eastcheap, London.
Samuel Gibson, of Burleigh.
Jeremiah Whitaker, M.A., of Stretton.
Edmund Stanton, D.D., of Kingston-on-Thames.
Daniel Featley, D.D., of Lambeth.
Francis Coke or Cooke, of Yoxhall.
John Lightfoot, of Ashley, *afterwards Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge.*
Edward Corbet, of Merton College, Oxford.
Samuel Hildersham, of Felton.
John Langley, of West Tuderley.
Christopher Tisdale, of Uphurst-borne.

Thomas Young, of Stowmarket.
John Phillips, of Wrentham, Suffolk.
Humphrey Chambers, B.D., of Claverton.
John Conant, B.D., of Lymington.
Henry Hall, B.D., of Norwich.
Henry Hutton, *M.A., of Caldbeck.*
Henry Scudder, of Collingborne.
Thomas Baylie, *B.D.*, of Manningford-Bruce.
Benjamin Pickering, of East Hoateley.
Henry Nye, of Clapham.
Arthur Sallaway, of Seavern Stoke.
Sydrach Simpson, of London.
Antony Burgesse, M.A., of Sutton Coldfield.
Richard Vines, of Calcot, *Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, afterwards a minister in London.*
William Greenhill, "*Evening Star*," of Stepney.
William Moreton, of Newcastle.
Richard Buckley.
Thomas Temple, D.D., of Battersea, Surrey.
Simeon Ashe, of St. Bride's.
William Nicholson.
Thomas Gattaker, B.D., of Rotherhithe.
James Weldy, of Selattyn.
Christopher Pashley, D.D., of Hawarden.
Henry Tozer, B.D.
William Spurstow, D.D., of Hampden, Bucks.
Francis Cheynell or Channell, of Oxford.
Edward Ellis, B.D., of Guilsfield.
John Hacket, D.D., of St. Andrew's, Holborne.
Samuel de la Place, John de la March, } *of French Church, London.*
Matthew Newcomen, of Dedham.
William Lyford, of Sherborne, Dorset.
[Thomas] Carter, M.A., of Dynton, Bucks.
William Lance, of Harrow, Middlesex.
Thomas Hodges, of Kensington.
Andreas Perne, of Wilby, Northampton.
Thomas Westfield, D.D., of St. Bartholomew the Great, Bishop of Bristol.

Henry Hammond, D.D., of Penshurst, Kent.
Nicholas Prophet, of Marlborough, Wilts.
Peter Sterry, of London.
John Erle, of Bishopton, Wilts.
John Gibbon or Guibon, of Waltham.
Henry Painter, B.D., of Exeter.
Thomas Micklethwaite, M.A., of Cherry-Burton.
John Wincop, D.D., of St. Martin's in the Fields.
William Price, St. Paul's, Covent Garden.
Henry Wilkinson, jun., B.D., Epping, Essex.
Richard Holdsworth or Oldsworth, D.D., Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
William Dunning, M.A., of Cold Aston.
Francis Woodcock, B.A., of St. Lawrence, Jewry, v. *Moreton, deceased.*
John Maynard, M.A., of Mayfield, Surrey, v. *H. Nye, deceased.*
Thomas Clendon, of All Hallows, Barking, v. *Nicholson, who did not attend.*
Daniel Cawdrey, M.A., St. Martin's in Fields, v. *Dr. Harris, of Winchester.*
William Rathbone, of Highgate, v. *Morley, who did not attend.*
John Strickland, of New Sarum, v. *Dr. Ward, deceased.*
William Good, B.D., of Denton, Norfolk.
John Bond, D.C.L., Master of the Savoy, v. *Archbishop Ussher.*
Humphrey Hardwick, of Hadham Magna, Herts.
John Ward, of Ipswich and of Brampton, v. *Painter, deceased.*
Edward Corbet, of Norfolk, v. *H. Hall, of Norwich.*
Philip Delmé or Delmy, of French Church, Canterbury, v. *Rathbone, deceased.*
Thomas Ford, M.A., of St. Faith's, London, v. *Bowles, deceased.*
Richard Byfield, of Long Ditton, Surrey, v. *Dr. Featley, deceased.*
John Dury or Durie, v. *Dr. Downing, deceased.*

William Strong, preacher in Westminster Abbey, v. *Peale, deceased.*
Robert Johnston, of York, v. *Carter, deceased.*
Samuel Boulton, of St. Saviour's, Southwark, v. *Burroughes, deceased.*[1]

CLERKS OF THE ASSEMBLY.

Henry Roborough, *of St. Leonard's, Eastcheap, London.*
Adoniram Byfield, M.A., *afterwards of Fulham.*

AMANUENSIS.

John Wallis, M.A., *afterwards Savilian Professor of Geometry, Oxford.*

SCOTTISH COMMISSIONERS.

Ministers.

Alexander Henderson, of Edinburgh.
Robert Douglas, of Edinburgh.
Samuel Rutherfurd, of St. Andrews.
Robert Baillie, of Glasgow.
George Gillespie, of Edinburgh.
Robert Blair, of St. Andrews.

Elders.

John, Earl of Cassilis (*did not attend*).
John, Lord Maitland, *afterwards the notorious Lauderdale.*
Sir Archibald Johnston, of Warriston.
Robert Meldrum, in absence of Johnston.
John, Earl of Loudon.
Sir Charles Erskine.
John, Lord Balmerino, v. *Loudon.*
Archibald, Marquis of Argyll.
George Winrham, of Libberton, v. *Argyll.*

[1] Out of the above one hundred and thirty-nine divines, it appears that about thirty never attended the meetings of Assembly. The absence of the King's sanction was, of course, a difficulty with many.

APPENDIX III.

The Solemn League and Covenant.

We Noblemen, Barons, Knights, Gentlemen, Citizens, Burgesses, Ministers of the Gospel, and Commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by the providence of GOD, living under one King, and being of one reformed religion, having before our eyes the glory of GOD, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the honour and happiness of the King's Majesty and his posterity, and the true publick liberty, safety, and peace of the kingdoms, wherein every one's private condition is included: And calling to mind the treacherous and bloody plots, conspiracies, attempts, and practices of the enemies of GOD, against the true religion and professors thereof in all places, especially in these three kingdoms, ever since the reformation of religion; and how much their rage, power, and presumption are of late, and at this time, increased and exercised, whereof the deplorable state of the Church and kingdom of Ireland, the distressed estate of the Church and kingdom of England, and the dangerous estate of the Church and kingdom of Scotland, are present and public testimonies; we have now at last (after other means of supplication, remonstrance, protestation, and sufferings), for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of GOD'S people in other nations, after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn League and Covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us

for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most High GOD, do swear,

I. That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of GOD, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the word of GOD, and the example of the best reformed Churches; and shall endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising; that we, and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.

II. That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (that is, Church government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical Officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and His name one, in the three kingdoms.

III. We shall, with the same sincerity, reality, and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavour, with our estates and lives, mutually to preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments, and the liberties of the kingdoms; and to preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion, and liberties of the kingdoms; that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminish his Majesty's just power and greatness.

IV. We shall also, with all faithfulness, endeavour the discovery of all such as have been or shall be incendiaries, malignants, or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the King from his people, or one of the kingdoms from another, or making any faction or parties amongst the people, contrary to this League and Covenant; that they may be brought to publick trial, and receive condign punishment, as the degree of their offences shall require or deserve, or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, shall judge convenient.

V. And whereas the happiness of a blessed peace between these kingdoms, denied in former times to our progenitors, is, by the good providence of GOD, granted unto us, and hath been lately concluded and settled by both Parliaments; we shall each one of us, according to our place and interest, endeavour that they may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union to all posterity; and that justice may be done upon the wilful opposers thereof, in manner expressed in the precedent article.

VI. We shall also, according to our places and callings, in this common cause of religion, liberty, and peace of the kingdoms, assist and defend all those that enter into this League and Covenant, in the maintaining and pursuing thereof; and shall not suffer ourselves, directly or indirectly, by whatsoever combination, persuasion, or terror, to be divided and withdrawn from this blessed union and conjunction, whether to make defection to the contrary part, or to give ourselves to a detestable indifferency or neutrality in this cause which so much concerneth the glory of GOD, the good of the kingdom, and honour of the King; but shall, all the days of our lives, zealously and constantly continue therein against all opposition, and promote the same, according to our power, against all lets and impediments whatsoever; and, what we are not able ourselves to suppress or overcome, we shall reveal and make known, that it may be timely

prevented or removed: All which we shall do as in the sight of God.

And, because these kingdoms are guilty of many sins and provocations against GOD, and His Son JESUS CHRIST, as is too manifest by our present distresses and dangers, the fruits thereof; we profess and declare, before GOD and the world, our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins, and for the sins of these kingdoms: especially, that we have not as we ought valued the inestimable benefit of the Gospel; that we have not laboured for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not endeavoured to receive CHRIST in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of Him in our lives; which are the causes of other sins and transgressions so much abounding amongst us: and our true and unfeigned purpose, desire, and endeavour for ourselves, and all others under our power and charge, both in publick and in private, in all duties we owe to GOD and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation; that the Lord may turn away His wrath and heavy indignation, and establish these Churches and kingdoms in truth and peace.

And this covenant we make in the presence of ALMIGHTY GOD, the Searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed; most humbly beseeching the LORD to strengthen us by His HOLY SPIRIT for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with such success, as may be deliverance and safety to His people, and encouragement to other Christian Churches, groaning under, or in danger of, the yoke of antichristian tyranny, to join in the same or like association and covenant, to the glory of GOD, the enlargement of the kingdom of JESUS CHRIST, and the peace and tranquillity of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths.

APPENDIX IV.

A Description of the Westminster Assembly.

(Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, ii. 107–109.)

"Since my last, November 17th [1643], there are few news here. From that day to Monday, I think the 20th, we keeped in. . . . On Monday morning we sent to both Houses of Parliament for a warrant for our sitting in the Assemblie. This was readilie granted, and by Mr. Hendersone presented to the Proloqutor; who sent out three of their number to convoy us to the Assemblie. Here no mortal man may enter to see or hear, let be to sitt, without ane order in wryte from both Houses of Parliament. When we were brought in, Dr. Twisse had ane long harangue for our welcome, after so long and hazardous a voyage by sea and land, in so unseasonable a tyme of the year: when he had ended, we satt down in these places which since we have keeped. The like of that Assemblie I did never see, and, as we hear say, the like was never in England, nor anywhere is shortlie lyke to be. They did sit in Henry the 7th's Chappell, in the place of the Convocation; but since the weather grew cold, they did go to Jerusalem chamber, a faire roome in the Abbey of Westminster, about the bounds of the Colledge fore-hall, but wyder. At the one end nearest the doore, and both sydes, are stages of seats, as in the new Assemblie House at Edinburgh, but not so high; for there will be roome but for five or six score. At the upmost end there is a chair set on ane frame, a foot from the earth, for the Mr. Proloqutor Dr. Twisse. Before it on the ground stands two chairs for the two

Assessors, Dr. Burgess and Mr. Whyte. Before these two chairs, through the length of the roome, stands a table, at which sitts the two scribes, Mr. Byfield and Mr. Roborough. The house is all well hung, and hes a good fyre, which is some dainties at London. Foranent the table, upon the Proloqutor's right hand, there are three or four rankes of formes. On the lowest we five doe sit. Upon the other, at our backs, the members of Parliament deputed to the Assemblie. On the formes foranent us, on the Proloqutor's left hand, going from the upper end of the house to the chimney, and at the other end of the house, and backsyde of the table, till it come about to our seats, are four or five stages of fourmes, whereupon these divines sitts as they please; albeit commonlie they keep the same place. From the chimney to the door, there is no seats, but a voyd for passage. The Lords of Parliament uses to sit on chaires, in that voyd, about the fire. We meet every day of the week, but Saturday. We sitt commonlie from nine to one or two afternoon. The Proloqutor at the beginning and end hes a short prayer. The man, as the world knows, is very learned in the questions he hes studied, and very good, beloved of all, and highlie esteemed; but merelie bookish, and not much, as it seems, acquaint with conceived prayer, [and] among the unfittest of all the company for any action; so after the prayer he sitts mute. It was the canny convoyance of these who guides most matters for their own interest to plant such a man of purpose in the chaire. The one assessour, our good friend Mr. Whyte, hes keeped in of the gout since our coming; the other, Dr. Burgess, a very active and sharpe man, supplies, so farr as is decent, the Proloqutor's place. Ordinarlie there will be present above threescore of these divines. These are divided in three Committees; in one whereof every man is a member. No man is excluded who pleases to come to any of the three. Every Committee, as the Parliament gives order in wryte to take any purpose to consideration, takes a portion, and in their afternoon meeting prepares matters for the Assemblie,

setts doune their mind in distinct propositions, backs their propositions with texts of Scripture. After the prayer, Mr. Byfield, the scribe, reads the proposition and Scriptures, whereupon the Assemblie debates in a most grave and orderlie way. No man is called up to speak; bot who stands up of his own accord, he speaks so long as he will without interruption. If two or three stand up at once, then the divines confusedlie calls on his name whom they desyre to hear first: On whom the loudest and maniest voices calls, he speaks. No man speaks to any bot to the Proloqutor. They harangue long and very learnedlie. They studie the questions well before hand, and prepares their speeches; but withall the men are exceeding prompt, and well spoken. I doe marvell at the very accurate and extemporall replyes that many of them usuallie doe make. When, upon every proposition by itself, and on everie text of Scripture that is brought to confirme it, every man who will hes said his whole minde, and the replyes, and duplies, and triplies are heard; then the most part calls, To the question. Byfield the scribe rises from the table, and comes to the Proloqutor's chair, who, from the scribe's book, reads the proposition, and says, as many as are in opinion that the question is well stated in the proposition, let them say I; when I is heard, he says, as many as think otherwise, say No. If the difference of I's and No's be cleare, as usuallie it is, then the question is ordered by the scribes, and they go on to debate the first Scripture alleadged for proof of the proposition. If the sound of I and No be near equall, then sayes the Proloqutor, as many as say I, stand up; while they stand, the scribe and others number them in their minde; when they sitt down, the No's are bidden stand, and they likewise are numbered. This way is clear enough and saves a great deal of time, which we spend in reading our catalogue. When a question is once ordered, there is no more debate of that matter; but if a man will vaige, he is quicklie taken up by Mr. Assessor, or many others, confusedlie crying, Speak to order, to order. No man

contradicts another expresslie by name, bot most discreetlie speaks to the Proloqutor, and at most holds on the generall, The Reverend brother, who latelie or last spoke, on this hand, on that syde, above, or below. I thought meet once for all to give yow a taste of the outward form of this Assemblie. They follow the way of their Parliament. Much of their way is good, and worthie of our imitation; only their longsomenesse is wofull at this time, when their Church and Kingdome lyes under a most lamentable anarchy and confusion. They see the hurt of their length, but cannot get it helped; for being to establish a new Plattforme of worship and discipline to their Nation for all time to come, they think they cannot be answerable, if solidlie, and at leisure, they doe not examine every point thereof."

INDEX.

The numbers refer to the pages.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

Published by **T. & T. CLARK,** Edinburgh.

WORKS OF IMPORTANCE IN THE PRESENT CHURCH CRISIS.

In post 8vo, Second Edition, price 3s. 6d.,

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND:

HER ORIGIN, FOUNDERS, AND TESTIMONY. By PETER BAYNE, LL.D.

'A most fascinating history. . . . We have seldom read a book with such a glow, with such a lofty moral and spiritual fervour.'—*Review of the Churches.*

'Read Dr. Bayne's fine book.'—Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D.

In cloth covers, 8d.; in paper covers, 6d.,

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND:

HER ANCESTRY, HER CLAIMS, and HER CONFLICTS. By the Rev. C. G. M'CRIE, D.D.

In crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d.,

SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY.

By the Rev. NORMAN L. WALKER, D.D.

'A very beautiful account of the history of Church matters in Scotland. . . . The utmost fairness and breadth characterises its treatment of questions and persons in opposition.'—*Presbyterian Churchman.*

In crown 8vo, price 2s.,

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH.

With Introduction and Notes. By the late Rev. J. MACPHERSON, M.A.

'This volume is executed with learning, discrimination, and ability.'—*British Messenger.*

'A work of great ability, giving a vast amount of information alike as to the history and meaning of that venerable Presbyterian symbol, and explaining its successive sections in the light of modern attacks upon its doctrine.'—*Young Men's Christian Magazine.*

In crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d.,

PRESBYTERIANISM.

By the late Rev. J. MACPHERSON, M.A.

'A solid piece of workmanship, remarkable for the vast amount of information presented in a small compass, and so clearly set forth.'—*Christian Leader.*

In crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net,

THE THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN ITS FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

By the late Professor W. HASTIE, D.D., Glasgow.

'The work so long looked for is now published, and it is to be hoped that it will be widely and kindly received. No intelligent reader of it can fail to find in its pages much information, eloquently stated, regarding both the history and the characteristics of the Reformed Theology.'—*From Prefatory Note by* Prof. R. FLINT, D.D.

BY PROFESSOR W. N. CLARKE, D.D.

The *Bookman* says: 'Dr. Clarke's charm both of thought and expression secures a welcome for anything he may write.'

Twelfth Edition now ready, post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

1. AN OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

'It is difficult to speak of this book in adequate terms without an appearance of exaggerated praise. . . . Here at last the great vital truths of the Christian faith are set along the lines of the highest thought of the liberal, reverent, modern mind, and with consummate skill and fascinating interest. Theology is no doubt the queen of the sciences, but, as usually presented, in somewhat austere, ponderous, antiquated guise, has little human attraction. Here it is quick with human interest, answering to the living thoughts of the living generation.'—*Puritan.*

In crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d.,

2. WHAT SHALL WE THINK OF CHRISTIANITY?

'Dr. Clarke's "Outline of Christian Theology" had a reception rarely accorded to an American book, and the sale is briskly proceeding. The new little book is written in the same charming simplicity of language, and its thoughts are as great and simple, that it is likely to find an equally warm welcome beside its elder brother. There are three chapters: (1) The Christian People; (2) The Christian Doctrine; (3) The Christian Power.'—*Expository Times.*

In crown 8vo, price 3s.,

3. CAN I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER?

'Dr. Clarke has here, as elsewhere, shown himself a master in the arts of popularising Christian apologetics.'—*Christian World.*

In demy 8vo, price 9s.,

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRIST;

Or, THE DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND ADAM. Being the Sixteenth Series of the 'Cunningham Lectures.' By the late DAVID SOMERVILLE, D.D.

'By its keen and profound insight, by its sanity, and by its fulness of knowledge, the volume will at once take its place as the best authority on that department of New Testament theology with which it deals.'—*Critical Review.*

In post 8vo, New and Cheaper Edition, price 6s.,

THE CHRIST OF HISTORY AND OF EXPERIENCE.

Being the 'Kerr Lectures' for 1897. By DAVID W. FORREST, D.D., Edinburgh.

'An exceedingly able treatment of a great and important subject.'—The late Professor CALDERWOOD.

'I name specially the admirable Handbooks for Bible Classes issued by T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh. They are very cheap, and among them are some books unsurpassed in their kind.'—**Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll** *In the* **British Weekly.**

'These little books are models of the multum in parvo *style. Little books on great subjects.'*—**Literary World.**

HANDBOOKS FOR BIBLE CLASSES AND PRIVATE STUDENTS.

EDITED BY

PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D., AND ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D.

PUBLISHED BY

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.

Price 2s.,

THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

With Introduction and Notes. By Prof. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

'Dr. Dods once more proves himself an able and accomplished biblical scholar; . . . his Notes are the fruit of wide reading and earnest thought. They are pithy, scholarly, and suggestive—as weighty as they are brief.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'Of the care with which the book has been done, and its thoroughness in every point, it is not possible to speak too highly.'—*Congregationalist.*

In Two Vols., price 2s. each,

THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

With Introduction, Commentary, Special Notes, Plans, etc. By the late Rev. JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., Oamaru.

'The ablest and most compendious exposition of the Book of Exodus ever published in this country.'—*Methodist New Connexion Magazine.*

'This is an excellent manual. The Introduction is really a treatise, and would be valuable to readers of far higher pretensions than "Bible Classes"; and it is wonderfully cheap too.'—*Literary Churchman.*

Price 1s. 6d.,

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

By the late Principal GEORGE C. M. DOUGLAS, D.D.

'I consider it a very valuable contribution to the full elucidation of one of the most interesting books in the Bible. Your treatment of each section is clear, simple, and intelligible to all readers. You have succeeded in shedding the light of modern travel and research upon the numerous topographical and historical details with which the writings of Joshua abound. I do not know any work of the same extent which possesses such an amount of valuable and trustworthy information.'—Rev. President PORTER, D.D., Belfast.

Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.

Price 1*s.* 3*d.*,

THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

By the late Principal GEORGE C. M. DOUGLAS, D.D.

'This volume is as near perfection as we can hope to find such a work.'—*Church Bells.*

Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

By Professor JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., T.C.D.

'Far beyond anything indicated by the small price of this work is its exceeding value for thoroughness of verbal exposition, exegetical criticism, and homiletic suggestiveness.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

THE SIX INTERMEDIATE MINOR PROPHETS.

OBADIAH—ZEPHANIAH. By the late Principal GEORGE C. M. DOUGLAS, D.D.

'Introductions and notes are alike clear, compact, and suggestive.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'Reverent, scholarly, comprehensive, and practical.'—*Christian.*

Price 2*s.*,

THE POST-EXILIAN PROPHETS—

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI. By Prof. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

'When the Books of the Old Testament are treated in this way, there is some hope that the standard of popular teaching will be sensibly raised. . . . We can only congratulate the rising generation in having guides like these.'—*Literary World.*

Price 2*s.* 6*d.*,

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.

With Introduction, Notes, and Maps. By Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D.

'A careful commentary, and will be found most useful.'—*Spectator.*

'To say that this book is fully equal to all and any of those which have preceded it in the same series, is to give it high praise, but were we to say more even than that, we should not exaggerate. . . . There is a completeness about the work which gives it a peculiar value to the appreciative reader.'—*Christian.*

Part I., price 2*s.; Part II., price* 1*s.* 3*d.*,

ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

With Introduction, Notes, and Maps. By Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D.

'An admirable text-book, both for private aid and teaching purposes.'—*Spectator.*

'For point, clearness, freshness, and evangelical unction, they are not to be surpassed.'—*Young Men's Christian Magazine.*

Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.

In Two Vols., price 2s. each,

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

With Introduction and Notes. By Rev. GEORGE REITH, D.D.

'The general excellence of the series is more than maintained. Indeed, for persons who require much in little, we can recommend nothing better than this unpretentious little work, in which the "Golden Gospel" is opened up with admirable conciseness and clearness.'—*Christian.*

In Two Parts, price 1s. 6d. each,

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

With Introduction, Notes, and Map. By Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D.

'The largest and most pretentious books are not invariably the best. Frequently the value is in inverse ratio to the size, and this may certainly be affirmed of Dr. Lindsay's manual. It is of small bulk, but of great worth, giving us, in short compass, the best that has been thought and said in regard to the memorable section of Scripture with which it deals.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Price 2s.,

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

By the late Principal DAVID BROWN, D.D.

'We do not know a better book to recommend to Bible-class teachers or scholars in their study of this Epistle.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

Price 1s. 6d.,

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

With Introduction and Notes. By the late JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., OAMARU.

'Sound, fresh, vigorous, readable, and learned, it opens up the Epistle in a way which makes its meaning plain to the commonest capacity. No minister lecturing through Galatians should be without it; and the teacher of a Bible class may now, with it in his hand, venture to take the Epistle as a text-book.'—*Free Church Record.*

Price 1s. 6d.,

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

With Introduction and Notes. By Prof. J. S. CANDLISH, D.D.

'A model of conciseness and thoroughness.'—*Sunday School Chronicle.*

'For a cheap commentary there is nothing better than that published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. . . . A ripe and beautiful book.'—*British Weekly.*

Price 2s. 6d.,

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

By the late Professor A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.

'For its size and price one of the very best theological handbooks with which I am acquainted—a close grappling with the thought of the Epistle by a singularly strong and candid mind.'—Professor SANDAY in the *Academy.*

Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.

Price 2s. 6d.,

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

A New Translation, with Introduction, Commentary, and Appendix. By the Rev. J. P. LILLEY, D.D.

'An exceedingly rich addition to the series. It is thoroughly adapted to the needs of all Bible students, both ministers and laymen. . . . The author handles the data with scholarly independence, and his clear, fresh way of putting things is everywhere in evidence.'—*American Journal of Theology.*

Price 1s. 6d.,

BISHOP BUTLER'S THREE SERMONS

UPON HUMAN NATURE. With Introduction and Notes. By Prof. THOMAS B. KILPATRICK, D.D.

'Mr. Kilpatrick has written a decidedly able introduction, with valuable notes. His treatment of the aim of ethical study, and of the writings of British moralists, is clear, concise, and suitable.'—Prof. CALDERWOOD, LL.D.

'The best edition of the famous sermons that we have ever seen. No student of Butler should fail to procure it.'—*Literary World.*

Price 2s.,

THE REFORMATION.

By Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D.

'The best popular account we have yet seen of the causes, principles, and results of this momentous movement, whose main incidents it graphically describes. As a handbook the work is complete.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Price 2s.,

HISTORY OF THE IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

By President THOMAS HAMILTON, D.D., Belfast.

'This is a most excellent handbook, and entirely worthy to take its place beside the other publications of the same series, all of which are written by distinguished men.'—*Belfast Northern Whig.*

Price 2s. 6d.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM.

By ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D., United Free St. George's, Edinburgh.

'Really good. In every Scotch family this ought to be found. Our English folk are not so well acquainted with "The Shorter Catechism"; but those who are will be glad to have a handbook upon it, so clear, so true, and so lively. . . . Theology of this stamp will do us all good. Scatter it; its leaves are for the healing of the nations. Half a crown laid out in this book will purchase no regrets.'—Mr. SPURGEON.